

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 16293) granting an increase of pension to Fred G. Pettigrew; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITLEY: A bill (H. R. 16294) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16295) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Tunstall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8616. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of residents of New York State, urging the passage of House bill 7884, providing for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8617. By Mr. BRUNNER: Resolution of the Long Island Chamber of Commerce, New York, opposing transfer of all or any part of the New York State Canal system to Federal Government under terms and conditions of rivers and harbors act of July 3, 1930; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

8618. By Mr. CRAWL: Petition of many citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., favoring the passage of House bill 7884, for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8619. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of Trades and Labor Council, of Wichita Falls, Tex., indorsing the move of the Independent Oil Operators for their plea for an embargo on crude oil and its by-products from foreign countries, and supported by the Carpenters' Local Union, No. 977, Painters' Local Union, No. 393, the Retail Merchants' Association, and other like organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8620. Also, petition of the port and waterways committee of the Long Island Chamber of Commerce, opposing the transfer of all or any part of the New York State Canal system to the Federal Government under the terms and conditions set forth in the rivers and harbors act of July 3, 1930; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8621. Also, petition of New York State Holstein-Friesian Association, urging the suspension of the recent ruling of the Commissioner of the Bureau of Internal Revenue that unbleached palm oil may be used in the manufacture of oleo; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8622. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of Dan Shaser and other residents of Cashmere, Wash., asking for the passage of House bill 15489, providing for increase of pensions to Indian-war veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

8623. By Mr. KIEFNER: Petition of A. B. Bourne, W. A. Gordon, et al., of Bunker, Reynolds County, Mo., urging the enactment of legislation for the immediate payment of adjusted compensation to World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8624. Also, petition of William M. Simpson, et al., of Potosi, Washington County, Mo., urging payment in lump sum of adjusted compensation to veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8625. Also, petition of members of the American Legion Post, No. 185, Greenville, Wayne County, Mo., urging the passage of legislation for the payment of the adjusted compensation to all World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8626. By Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY: Petition of the American Legion Department of Illinois, for payment of full face value of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8627. By Mr. RAMSPECK: Petition of 408 veterans of the World War of Atlanta, Ga., requesting Congress to enact legislation providing for the immediate payment of the face value of their adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8628. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Parent-Teachers Association, of Waynesburg, Pa., urging enactment of the Hudson

motion picture bill, H. R. 9986; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8629. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition of citizens of the fifth congressional district, San Francisco, Calif., urging the enactment of House bill 7884; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8630. By Mr. WILLIAMS: Petition from the Trades and Labor Council of Wichita Falls, Tex.; Carpenters Local Union, No. 977; Painters Local Union, No. 292; Retail Merchants Association; and other like organizations, indorsing the move of the independent oil operators for an embargo on crude oil and its by-products from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8631. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Rev. P. G. Van Zandt, pastor First Baptist Church, Joliet, Ill., urging the passage of legislation whereby only citizens should be counted in determining the representation in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8632. Also, petition of J. A. Del Mar, 903 Michigan Avenue, Evanston, Ill., urging the House of Representatives to pass Senate bill 4123, for refinancing of levee drainage of southern Missouri; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

8633. Also, petition of H. B. Hill, president Abraham Lincoln Life Insurance Co., Springfield, Ill., urging the passage of the Glenn-Smith bill, which has passed the Senate and is now before the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JANUARY 17, 1931

(Legislative day of Monday, January 5, 1931)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

LITTLE BAY BRIDGE, NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, yesterday, by unanimous consent, on a report from the Committee on Commerce, I secured the passage of the bill (S. 5688) granting the consent of Congress to the State of New Hampshire to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or dike across Little Bay at or near Fox Point. Upon examining the text of the bill I discover the form used in transcribing it is erroneous and that the words "or dike" should be added wherever the word "bridge" occurs in the bill. I ask unanimous consent for a reconsideration of the votes by which the bill was read the third time and passed and that the amendments may be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed will be reconsidered, and the amendments will be made; and, without objection, the bill as amended will be passed.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|-----------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Ashurst | George | McKellar | Smith |
| Barkley | Gillett | McMaster | Smoot |
| Bingham | Glass | McNary | Steck |
| Black | Glenn | Metcalf | Steiner |
| Blaine | Goff | Morrison | Stephens |
| Borah | Goldsborough | Morrow | Swanson |
| Bratton | Gould | Moses | Thomas, Idaho |
| Brookhart | Hale | Norbeck | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bulkley | Harris | Norris | Townsend |
| Capper | Harrison | Nye | Trammell |
| Caraway | Hastings | Oddie | Tydings |
| Carey | Hawes | Partridge | Vandenberg |
| Connally | Hayden | Patterson | Wagner |
| Copeland | Hebert | Philpotts | Walcott |
| Couzens | Heflin | Pine | Walsh, Mass. |
| Cutting | Howell | Pittman | Walsh, Mont. |
| Dale | Johnson | Reed | Waterman |
| Davis | Jones | Robinson, Ark. | Watson |
| Deneen | Kean | Schall | Wheeler |
| Dill | Kendrick | Sheppard | Williamson |
| Fess | Keyes | Shipstead | |
| Fletcher | Kling | Shortridge | |
| Frazier | McGill | Simmons | |

Mr. GOFF. My colleague the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HATFIELD] is unavoidably absent. I should like to have this statement stand for the day.

Mr. WATSON. My colleague [Mr. ROBINSON] of Indiana is detained on account of illness in his family. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. BLAINE. My colleague the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is unavoidably absent. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from Sunswan Won-Kingsing, secretary of the American-Chinese Protective De Jure Association, Brooklyn, N. Y., transmitting resolutions adopted by that association memorializing the Congress to repeal or modify the Chinese exclusion act or any other acts that may be unjust and discriminatory to the Chinese people, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the mayor and council of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 6603, providing a 44-hour work week for postal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a memorial, signed by John F. Dryden, Robert C. Jones, and Milton W. King, commanders of the Washington Crusaders, of Washington, D. C., in behalf of that organization, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Howell bill, being the bill (S. 3344) supplementing the national prohibition act for the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram from representatives of the Seminole and Euchee Tribes, from 18 Creek tribal towns in Oklahoma, favoring the passage of legislation extending restrictions on inherited lands in the Creek Nation, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of Patrick Gallagher, a resident of the District of Columbia and a citizen of the State of New York, praying for himself certain relief, redress, and reparations, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. TYDINGS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Frederick, Roland Park, Frederick and Harford Counties, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BINGHAM presented petitions numerous signed by sundry citizens of the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of legislation for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by Victory Post, No. 4, the American Legion, of Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of legislation providing for the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates of ex-service men, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Topeka, Kans., praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hyattsville, Md., praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Alumnae Association of Mount de Sales Academy, of Catonsville, Md., remonstrating against the passage of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MODERNIZATION OF BATTLESHIPS—MEMORIAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the National Board in Assembly of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram]

SWARTHMORE, PA., January 16, 1931.

VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,

Capitol.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: We request that you, as President of the Senate, have following message read to Senate before consideration of resolution, sponsored by Senator SWANSON, that \$30,000,000 be appropriated for modernization of three battleships:

"To United States Senate:

"The National Board of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, with members in every State, call upon the Senate to defeat \$30,000,000 appropriation to modernize three old battleships. Such expenditure out of harmony with agreements among nations to which we are a party. We have renounced war as a national policy; we should therefore renounce battleships, not rebuild them. We understand effort being made to obtain support for this bill on grounds it will give employment to 5,000 men. We protest against use of unemployment issue in this way, but since it has been made we point out that 5,000 is small number to receive employment from expenditure of \$30,000,000. Earlier in the session \$150,000,000 was appropriated to provide work for unemployed, authoritatively estimated to be almost 5,000,000. Thirty million dollars desired for repairing three old battleships, if spent in road building, for example, would give employment to far larger and more diversified groups throughout entire country. We therefore call upon Senate to defeat Swanson measure as out of harmony with national policy and an extravagance in our present times."

NATIONAL BOARD IN ASSEMBLY,
WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE,
HANNAH CLOTHIER HILL, *Chairman*.
EMILY G. BLACH, *President*.

PROPOSED UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF—TREE PLANTING

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I have a communication from a lady who, as a measure of relief to the unemployed, proposes the planting of trees along the great main highways throughout the country. This is not original with her, but has heretofore been suggested quite repeatedly. I ask that the communication be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the matter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPLOY THE UNEMPLOYED

The Nation's great "business colossus" lies prostrate. The brains of our business men and financiers seem paralyzed. We, the greatest Nation on earth, are standing by, seemingly helpless to cope with the financial disaster that has befallen us. Men are prodding the great "business colossus" here and prodding it there trying to get it to start turning over. They get a little sign of life, then it drops back apparently dead as before.

Meanwhile men are walking the streets of our great cities begging for work.

Men, women, and children in this land of plenty are starving. People are hungry while our grain elevators are choked. Yet men know not what to do with their surplus wheat. The great "business colossus" has found no way to get this grain into the stomachs of the starving.

Farmers can get almost nothing for their crops. Often leaving them in the fields to rot while hunger stalks the land.

Their barn-stored wheat and corn is at the mercy of rat and weasel (who know no law).

Yet they still hold this grain, hoping for a price that will enable them to live and grow next year's crop.

Many farmers, because of the great drought, have nothing to sell and no food to feed their stock.

What has been the answer to this our great national tragedy? Some have said building, but so far the only answer has been charity—age-old charity.

But what man or woman worthy of the name wants charity? Isn't this a terrible indictment of one of the greatest nations on earth?

Farmers flat; food rotting in the field for want of a market; grain choking our elevators; banks failing; 5,000,000 men walking the streets, wanting work, they and their families starving.

Congress wants to help, but so far the only way suggested is to appropriate Government money to be used for our unemployed. Our business men are giving money, money with a lavish hand, which again means charity.

We must have charity to meet the present emergency, but can't we find a better way?

Are we not looking at this problem in parts rather than as a whole? Is not each one concentrated on his end of this great disaster, trying to pull himself through, when we should be looking at the thing as a national disaster which we could only cope with by pulling together?

Women have been known to step in where angels dared to tread. Women are now distributing charity.

Women are cooking food to be given as charity to the unemployed.

Men are giving money. Congress is appropriating money.

Legislatures are giving money.

All this work of men and women is for charity.

Five million men are asking for work, not charity.

Can we not pool all of this great effort and give these 5,000,000 men work?

Let us turn away from the sordid, hard things. We have had enough of them in the last 15 months.

Let us turn to nature, the great out-of-doors, and let beauty heal our wounds.

We have destroyed our forests with wanton waste to plant grain. Now that same grain seems to be destroying us.

Then let our slogan be "Plant trees."

"Plant trees" along our highways from ocean to ocean.

"Plant trees" from the Gulf to the Canadian border.

"Plant trees" now when cement roads can not be built.

Here is work for the skilled labor as well as the unskilled labor. The unskilled labor under directors can dig holes and make the beds.

The skilled labor can wrap and transplant the trees.

Here your farmers can find work with nature, where he is at home.

Many trucks belonging to farmers are now idle all over the land.

Uncle Sam can employ these trucks and their drivers to move workmen to and from their work.

Uncle Sam can use these same trucks to haul trees.

Tree-moving equipment can be made very simple.

A block and fall, a hoisting rig, a truck, etc.

Our unskilled labor can quickly be taught this work, as was demonstrated last year.

But this national planting must be done with very careful supervision.

We have all over the country landscape architects; theirs is a luxury business and they are unemployed.

Our nurseries are feeling the pinch and their trained men could supervise.

The tree surgeons have a small army of skilled workers who are finding jobs difficult.

Where there are military posts the men of the Army could supervise, and Army trucks utilized in hauling trees.

Transplant your soup kitchens from the city streets into the country and make them into canteens to feed our workers.

Here your idle women can be utilized to cook and serve these meals.

The Farm Board has millions of bushels of wheat they know not what to do with.

Take some of this wheat from the Farm Board; the whole grain and boil it.

Boil it three or four hours in double boilers.

Serve this cooked wheat with butter in place of bread.

Or serve it hot with sirup or brown sugar and milk.

This is nature's own food and nothing more wholesome could be found.

Sell each man a pound of this cooked wheat per day and 5,000,000 men would eat 80,333 bushels per day.

This much would be taken from our surplus and there must be no profiteers in this cooperative scheme.

We should work together as in war times.

Let this be war against business depression and unemployment.

Let it be war against hunger and suffering and gloom.

Then where will all the trees be found?

We must plant large trees—not switches.

It takes more time and means more work to plant large trees.

Planting large trees means saving years of waiting for our shaded boulevards.

Our nurseries have some large trees.

Our forestry departments can supply some.

Our woods are full of trees that need to be moved to allow full growth to those they are crowding.

Most owners of forests would gladly give these surplus trees to have their woods cleared that the remaining trees might grow.

Then there are fallen trees and branches that should be sawed into wood.

Here is work for unskilled labor, and the wood could be sold.

All forests in Europe are cleared of surplus growth.

Our wealthy spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to keep their woods clean.

Thus our long-neglected forests could be cleared and remaining trees allowed to grow in their majesty.

This should be done only with expert supervision.

Here your unemployed tree-moving companies and idle nursery-men and forestry departments could serve their country and themselves.

But who will command this national army of workmen, for all must be done orderly, artistically?

We have our National Planning Commission already formed here in Washington.

We have our State roads organizations functioning in each State.

A broad plan for our national boulevards could be made here by our Planning Commission.

Our governors with State roads organizations and landscape architects could carry out these plans in each State.

Trained men and landscape architects should be put in charge in each county.

Congress is appropriating millions and millions to be used for the unemployed.

Five million men are asking for work.

Senators, Congressmen, can't we put this money and these men together?

Can't we pay these men wages—minimum wages—to plant trees along our State roads?

Can't we transform our bare roads into boulevards with avenues of trees?

Can't we do this simply by paying men for work rather than giving these same men this same money for charity?

Farmers and laborers in small communities are suffering most.

Here is work that farmers and laborers everywhere can do.

Let all be paid moderate wages from the highest to the lowest.

Let no man profiteer in this our war against depression.

This is work that would interest our garden clubs everywhere.

Many of these trained women should be placed on committees.

They would doubtless select some spot to adorn as their contribution to the unemployed.

The Daughters of the American Revolution could mark some historical spot on our highways.

The federated clubs might select some special work as their contribution.

The Washington Junior League could start the ball rolling.

Make Connecticut Avenue a boulevard of majestic trees.

Junior leagues everywhere could be most helpful in this work.

All plans being submitted first to our Planning Commission that our highways may be decorated as a beautiful whole.

Our forestry departments should be greatly interested as a means of fire prevention.

Cleaning the underbrush in our woods would prevent many forest fires.

Again, tree planting would help to hide some of our billboards. This would greatly discourage billboard planting along our highways.

It is winter, but let us have a national picnic.

Clear your woods of underbrush and build your bonfires.

Keep your workers warm with the heat and cheer of these fires.

Let the steaming canteen carry the odor of well-cooked food.

Then our laborers with well-fed bodies and healthful work will have forgotten their bad dreams.

Our forests will have been made beautiful, our roads transformed into boulevards, and we will have solved our great unemployment problem.

Mrs. WILBUR W. HUBBARD.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. BROOKHART, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4434) for the relief of Walter J. Bryson Paving Co., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1317) thereon.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 5625) providing for the participation of the United States in A Century of Progress (the Chicago World's Fair Centennial Celebration) to be held at Chicago, Ill., in 1933, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1318) thereon.

REPORTS OF NOMINATIONS

As in executive session,

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported favorably the nominations of sundry officers in the Navy, which were placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. PHIPPS, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads reported favorably sundry post-office nominations, which were placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 5754) to authorize the sale of interest in land devised to the United States under the will of Sophie Chanquet; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 5755) authorizing the acquiring of sites and the erection of post-office buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KEYES:

A bill (S. 5756) authorizing the Secretary of War to exchange with the Rosslyn Connecting Railroad Co. lands on the Virginia shore of the Potomac River near the west end of the Arlington Memorial Bridge; and

A bill (S. 5757) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926 (45 Stat. 630), and acts amendatory thereof; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DENEEN:

A bill (S. 5758) for the relief of Louis Alfano; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAREY:

A bill (S. 5759) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Wilkinson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 5760) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie A. Foote (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 5761) to amend the act approved June 22, 1926, entitled "An act to amend that part of the act approved August 29, 1916, relative to retirement of captains, commanders, and lieutenant commanders of the line of the Navy," as amended by the act of March 4, 1929; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 5762) granting a pension to John G. Hougham (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 5763) granting a pension to Frederick D. Ranney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 5764) for the relief of Cowtan & Tout (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL:

A bill (S. 5765) for the relief of the Potomac Electric Power Co. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SWANSON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$20,000,000 for alterations and repairs required for the purpose of modernizing the U. S. S. *Idaho* and *Mississippi*, etc., intended to be proposed by him to House bill 15592, the first deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIM OF THE CREEK NATION OF INDIANS

Mr. PINE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 404), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Resolved, That the claim of the Creek Nation of Indians for compensation from the United States for lands acquired by the United States from said Indian tribe under Article I of the treaty of August 9, 1814 (7 Stat. 120), be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims in accordance with the provisions of section 151 of the Judicial Code (sec. 257, Code of Laws of the United States of America, 44 Stat. 898); and said court is authorized and directed, notwithstanding the lapse of time or the statutes of limitation and irrespective of any former adjudication or release, to inquire into the claim of said Indian tribe for just compensation for said lands, and to report the amount which in fairness and justice and under all the facts and circumstances the United States should pay to the Creek Nation of Indians as fair compensation for said lands, and to report its findings of fact and conclusions to the Congress. In reporting such amount the court shall take into consideration the amount for which the United States sold such lands as public lands less cost of survey and sale.

INVESTIGATION OF RETAIL MILK AND DAIRY PRODUCTS PRICES

Mr. BROOKHART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 405), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to investigate and report to the Senate the reasons for the failure of the retail price paid by the consumer for milk

and other dairy products to reflect the decline in the price received by the dairy farmer for such milk and dairy products, and particularly whether such failure is a result of a combination in restraint of trade.

Such investigation shall be conducted in connection with the investigation authorized by Senate Resolution 374, adopted January 16, 1931, and such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may exercise all the powers expressly conferred thereon by such resolution in order to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

INVESTIGATION OF SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I submit a Senate resolution, and I will ask that it go over under the rule. I will not ask to take it up to-day. It is a resolution that has the effect of amending Senate Resolution 215, under which the special committee investigating expenditures in elections have been working. I understand that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has submitted a similar resolution, and that it has gone over. It went over yesterday under the rule. I desire to take up this resolution at the same time that one is taken up.

The resolution (S. Res. 406) was ordered to lie over under the rule, as follows:

Resolved, That the special committee of the Senate to investigate campaign expenditures, created under authority of Senate Resolution 215, adopted April 10, 1930, is hereby further authorized and empowered, in the furtherance of the duties provided for in said resolution 215, to take possession of ballots and ballot boxes and to impound the same for examination and consideration by said committee.

CHARLES H. BEWLEY

As in executive session,

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, yesterday I asked unanimous consent, as in executive session, to withdraw the nomination of Charles H. Bewley to be postmaster at Greeneville, Tenn., and to have it referred back to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] desired to have the request go over. I will state to the Senator from Utah that I have talked with the chairman of the committee and this action is entirely satisfactory to him. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the nomination from the calendar and that it be recommitted to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RULING OF INTERNAL-REVENUE COMMISSIONER ON COLORED OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a recent ruling of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, which, in my judgment, practically nullifies legislation enacted by the Congress for the protection of the public against buying oleomargarine under the impression it is getting butter. On behalf of the dairy industry and the agricultural West I desire to protest against this unjust ruling. I am sending to the desk a copy of the ruling referred to with the request that it be printed in the RECORD, accompanied by protests and statements from the farm organizations. During the few weeks this ruling has been in effect the wholesale price of butter has dropped from 45 cents a pound to as low as 26 cents a pound. There seems to be little doubt but that this ruling is responsible for a drop of 10 cents a pound, which means it will cost the dairy farmers of this country between five and six hundred million dollars a year, or one-sixteenth of the agricultural income of the Nation.

The effect of the ruling of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is to abrogate the protective provision of the oleomargarine act by allowing oleo manufacturers to color oleomargarine with unbleached palm oil without paying the 10 cents a pound tax levied against artificially colored butter substitutes. I have before me the advertisement of one of the manufacturers of this unbleached palm-oil synthetic butter, in which it is stated that "millions of new customers are being created" for this type of synthetic butter. The advertisement also states that "it offers distributors a rare opportunity for tremendous sales, rapid turnover, and steady profits."

Mr. President, I ask permission to place in the RECORD the following statement from Mr. Burnet, covering the ruling

allowing the use of unbleached palm-oil synthetic butter free from the 10 cents a pound tax.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Reference is made to the use of unbleached palm oil in the manufacture of oleomargarine and to previous rulings of the bureau in connection therewith.

You are advised that the bureau upon further consideration and investigation now holds that the unbleached palm oil free from artificial coloration when used in substantial quantities in relation to the other ingredients may be used in the manufacture of oleomargarine otherwise free from artificial coloration without subjecting the finished product to tax at the rate of 10 cents per pound.

All rules of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in so far as they may be contrary to this holding are hereby revoked. You are requested to forward immediately to each manufacturer of oleomargarine in your district a copy of this letter.

DAVID BURNET, *Commissioner*.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also ask permission to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following the copy of the Burnet ruling, letters and statements from representatives of the National Grange, the National Dairy Union, and the American Farm Bureau Federation, all of which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matters referred to are as follows:

[From the National Grange]

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Inclosed herewith please find a booklet which summarizes the legislative program of the National Grange. After you have looked it over, it will be appreciated if you will kindly file it for future reference.

We hope that before the close of the present session urgently needed legislation for the protection of the dairy industry may be enacted. As you will note, at its recent annual convention the Grange adopted a resolution in favor of legislation forbidding the use of oleomargarine as a substitute for butter in Government institutions. It is deplorable that more than five times as much oleomargarine as butter is now being used in our 11 national homes for disabled volunteer soldiers.

On November 12, 1930, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, David Burnet, made a ruling which enables the manufacturers of oleomargarine employing palm oil for coloring purposes to escape with a tax of one-fourth cent a pound instead of 10 cents per pound, which has heretofore been demanded in the sale of oleomargarine colored in semblance of butter. This ruling has had disastrous effects upon agriculture, and if not revoked it is estimated that it will deprive the industry of one-sixteenth of its total income. It is hoped that this ruling may be rescinded, because we believe it is not in accord with the law. But if it is allowed to stand, the need for clarifying legislation before the close of this session will be imperative.

The Grange favors early action by Congress embodying corrective amendments to the Federal farm loan act, legislation forbidding gambling in agricultural products, and the enactment of the export debenture plan and other needed agricultural legislation.

Sincerely yours,

FRED BRECKMAN,
Washington Representative.

[From the January issue of the National Grange Monthly]

(By Fred Breckman, Washington Representative)

A BIG SLUMP IN BUTTER PRICES—DUE TO NEW RULING ON SALE OF OLEOMARGARINE

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Burnet, whose bureau is charged with the enforcement of the Federal oleomargarine law, recently made a ruling to the effect that oleomargarine colored yellow by the use of palm oil would not be required to pay the tax of 10 cents per pound required of oleomargarine having a yellow tint. This ruling has had a disastrous effect upon butter prices. Butter has been selling in the New York markets at wholesale for 30 cents per pound during recent weeks. During previous years the average price of butter in the same market, during December and January, has been around 45 cents a pound. Dairy specialists estimate that about half of the slump in prices on butter is due to this ruling.

On December 22 the Washington representative of the Grange, together with other farm and dairy representatives, called upon Mr. Burnet and asked that the ruling be suspended and that a hearing be granted in this connection for the purpose of presenting the facts in the case. The hearing was set for January 10.

It should be explained that under the law white or naturally colored oleomargarine pays a Federal tax of one-fourth cent per pound. Yellow oleomargarine is required to pay a tax of 10 cents a pound. Palm oil gives oleomargarine a yellow tint just like butter. Its use in the manufacture of oleomargarine is of recent date. There is a difference of opinion as to whether this oil, used

for coloring purposes, constitutes an evasion of the oleomargarine law or not.

The representatives of the farm organizations at their informal conference with Commissioner Burnet contended that the recent ruling constituted an evasion of the law. The point may have to be cleared up by bringing a test case in court. If the decision should be in favor of the oleomargarine interests, clarifying legislation will be demanded from Congress. In the meantime it appears to the farm interests that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue should have ruled the other way and have gone to court, if necessary, in defense of the ruling. It is clearly the intent of Congress, as expressed in the oleomargarine law, that oleomargarine colored in semblance of butter shall pay a tax of 10 cents per pound.

[From the National Dairy Union]

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: You will recall a communication sent to you in December asking your interest in preventing a very serious blow to the dairy industry—the so-called "palm-oil ruling" by Commissioner David Burnet.

We appreciate your interest. Several Senators replying to that letter have transmitted to us the defense which Commissioner Burnet has made to our complaint.

We wish to inform you of two facts:

The first is that we take positive issue with Commissioner Burnet's defense of his action. He quotes therein a certain regulation of his bureau (sec. 43a) and says that this regulation justifies his decision that palm oil is not "artificial coloration." We have taken issue with this, supporting our contentions with appropriate briefs based on United States Supreme Court decisions and a study of the intent of Congress in the oleomargarine act. These show that the ruling is not in accord with the regulation quoted, and further that the regulation itself is probably invalid. (*Morrill v. Jones*, 106 U. S. 166.)

The second is that the palm-oil ruling has had a most disastrous effect on the whole dairy industry. The ruling resulted in the appearance of yellow oleomargarine in groceries and markets everywhere, except in States which wisely forbid its sale. The butter market, already crowded to its limits to sustain prices in this bad period, broke disastrously as the stock market did a year previously. Prices of butter have slumped from 38 cents to 27 cents—11 cents a pound. This has cost dairy farmers at least \$1,000,000 per day in declines of values of all dairy products. The Federal Farm Board has already taken cognizance of this serious condition. All these facts have been placed before Commissioner Burnet.

We allege on behalf of the dairy industry that this loss—ruinous to us; threatening to all agricultural stability; likely to continue our agricultural depression into the indefinite future—is chiefly due to an unwarranted ruling of a new administrative officer, uncalled for at the time it was made, and now found to be, in the judgment of our best advisers and counsel, of very questionable legality.

We are appealing to Commissioner Burnet for relief. He gave us a hearing on January 10. No decision has been rendered. We now wish you to have the facts that you can assist and advise us further.

Yours respectfully,

A. M. LOOMIS.

[From the American Farm Bureau Federation]

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION PROTESTS RULING FAVORING OLEO COLORING

A recent ruling by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue permitting oleomargarine colored by the use of unbleached palm oil to escape the 10 cents per pound tax on artificially colored butter substitutes was protested by Chester H. Gray, director of the American Farm Bureau Federation legislative department, and other farm leaders jointly on December 27.

A further hearing is to be given the farm leaders by the commissioner, David Burnet, January 10, at which a larger group, including legal counsel, will discuss the ruling.

It was contended that under the act of 1902 anything put in oleomargarine in any quantity whatever to make it look like butter constituted artificial coloration in the intent of Congress. The act provides that "when oleomargarine is free from artificial coloration that causes it to look like butter of any shade of yellow, said tax shall be one-fourth of 1 cent per pound." The regulations issued by the Bureau of Internal Revenue under this act provided that "oleomargarine is not free from artificial coloration if it looks like butter of any shade of yellow, except where such yellow color results from naturally colored oils or other materials which are used in substantial quantities in relation to the other ingredients, and which serve some material function or functions in addition to imparting color to the finished product."

NEW PROCESS DEVELOPED

Recently manufacturers have developed a process whereby unbleached palm oil can be produced which when used in proper proportion with other ingredients imparts to the finished oleo a color closely simulating that of butter without adding any other coloring. The commissioner has ruled that when unbleached palm oil is used without the addition of any other coloring matter the product is not artificially colored, and therefore not subject to the tax of 10 cents per pound but rather to a tax of only one-fourth of 1 cent per pound, which is about sufficient to pay for the cost of inspection.

Farm leaders take the position that the commissioner's interpretation is erroneous in construing that the term "artificial coloration" as used in the act does not include the use of naturally colored oils like unbleached palm oil. Farm leaders contend that Congress defined the term "artificial coloration" in the act itself by the addition of the phrase, "that causes it to look like butter of any shade of yellow."

In addition to Mr. Gray, those at the first conference with Commissioner Burnet were: Representative Robert G. Simmons, Nebraska; Freck Brenckman, Washington representative National Grange; Charles W. Holman, executive secretary National Cooperative Milk Producers' Association; A. M. Loomis, secretary, and Samuel Schlosser, director, National Dairy Union; R. W. Balderson, manager National Dairy Council; C. L. Poole, president elect New York Mercantile Exchange; and W. F. Jensen, manager American Association of Creamery Butter Manufacturers.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION CONTINUES FIGHT ON OLEO-MARGARINE RULING

Another vigorous protest against the recent ruling of Commissioner of Internal Revenue David Burnet, allowing the use of unbleached palm oil in the manufacture of oleomargarine without subjecting the finished product to a tax of 10 cents per pound, was registered by a delegation which appeared before the commissioner January 10.

Chester H. Gary, director of the American Farm Bureau Federation legislative department, acted as chairman of the group and made the opening statement, explaining the position of the delegation to Commissioner Burnet.

Representative HOMER HOCH, of Kansas, acted as spokesman of a delegation from the House, which included also Representative STRONG, Kansas; DICKINSON, Iowa; BRIGHAM, Vermont; BRAND, Ohio; and KYALE, of Minnesota. This committee was appointed as a result of a meeting of representatives of 20 States. Representative HOCH undertook to explain to the commissioner the intent of Congress when it passed the oleomargarine act. He explained that Congress intended to subject to the 10 cents per pound tax, any oleomargarine containing any coloring whatever simulating butter, regardless of whether the coloring is obtained by the use of colored oil which has additional properties, such as unbleached yellow palm oil.

Senators CAPPER of Kansas, and HOWELL, of Nebraska, likewise protested against the ruling.

Others joining in the protest were Fred Brenckman, Washington representative National Grange; A. M. Loomis, secretary National Dairy Federation; W. F. Jensen, National Association of Creamery Butter Manufacturers; and Charles W. Holman, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 9991) to fix the salary of the minister to Liberia, and it was signed by the Vice President.

THE DROUGHT SITUATION

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, there is living in my State an ex-service man who is 68 per cent disabled. He is a farmer by training, but he also possesses a great deal of literary skill. He has written a poem touching the drought situation and sent it to me. I ask unanimous consent that it may be incorporated in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The poem referred to is as follows:

(Respectfully ascribed to His Excellency Herbert Hoover, President of the United States of America)

OUR FLIGHT

For once the hills we love have failed
In their response to toil of willing hands;
Our farm lands did not yield accustomed mete
Of clothing and of food our need demands.

All summer last we watched with anxious eyes
Each little cloud that decked our horizon;
The blazing sun, it seemed, seared e'en the skies,
But hope we kept, 'till every chance was gone.

The drought, a hideous, monstrous thing,
Like fabled dragon spouting fiery breath,
Consuming all the hope within our breasts,
Left a blackened, blasted trail as grim as death.

But our southern courage is not ebbing low,
And faith in God is strong within our heart;
O will you help us, noble friend, in this dire need of ours?
You who were not hurt; oh, do not neglect your part.

To us, rough-handed feeders of the world,
'Tis strange to feel the weakening touch of hunger's hand,
To see terror in the patient eyes we love,
Our brave companions, gentle daughters of the land.

We are not asking much; only a chance
To earn the food and clothing by hard work;
Do not deny this bit, O friend of ours,
The need is great; in name of mercy, do not shirk.

To drought sufferers in stricken States, feelingly dedicated.

HERBERT A. MESSICK,
Gassville, Ark.

INVESTIGATIONS BY TARIFF COMMISSION

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, on the 5th of the present month I offered Senate resolution 390, calling upon the Tariff Commission to investigate the difference in the cost of production of foreign and domestic casein. On the same day I also submitted Senate Resolution 389, calling upon the Tariff Commission to investigate the difference in the cost of production of foreign and domestic dried eggs, dried egg yolk, and dried egg albumen. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] very properly asked that the two resolutions go over under the rule. I understand that there will be no objection to their consideration now, and I ask unanimous consent that the two resolutions may be taken from the table and may be considered and adopted by the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I can not consent if action on the resolutions will lead to any discussion.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I understand there will be no discussion at all.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I shall not make any objection to the consideration of the resolutions.

Mr. SMOOT. Will not the Senator from California defer his request until Monday?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I can not imagine that there will be any objection to the adoption of the resolutions at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. There are only a few Senators in the Chamber.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. No discourtesy is intended to those Senators when I ask for action when they are not here. I thought, however, the resolutions could be disposed of, as I do not think there is any objection to them.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that after the quorum call on Monday if he desires to submit the request at that time I will have no objection to it, but I do not want the resolutions acted upon at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). Objection is made.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Very well.

WORLD WAR ACTIVITIES OF WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, in view of recent publications relating to the proceedings and transaction in the War Department during the period of the World War, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by Hon. CARTER GLASS in the House of Representatives on Thursday, February 7, 1918.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE WAR DEPARTMENT

(Speech of Hon. CARTER GLASS, of Virginia, in the House of Representatives Thursday, February 7, 1918)

Mr. Chairman, may I not, at the outset of what I shall presently say, appeal to the record of 16 years' service in the House to attest the assertion that I have never in all that time sought occasion nor availed myself of the privilege to speak here on any topic with the consideration of which I was not specially charged by reason of committee assignments? And now, when I am about to deviate momentarily from the rule, I would very sincerely regret to have it supposed for one minute that it was with any degree of eagerness that I reached the conclusion to address myself to-day to a subject with which many of my colleagues have much greater familiarity, but in which, I may ven-

ture to hope, no Member has a keener or more imperative interest. Indeed, it is a problem which comes home to the bosom of every American citizen, and while some Members of Congress, by reason of long and intimate association with military affairs, are mentally trained in the technique and terminology and intricate details of our war-making establishment, and will, at an appropriate time, present and elucidate for us the things which we shall be asked to consider and approve, there are, nevertheless, some matters of such common knowledge and general concern that any of us might feel warranted in discussing them. It is a thing of this description that has recently arrested the attention of the country, and it is upon this I am constrained to talk.

On the 19th day of January the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the United States Senate made an address in New York City before an association called the National Security League, and among the deductions presented to the assembled audience, amid manifestations of applause, was that contained in the remarkable declaration that—

"The Military Establishment of America has fallen down. There is no use to be optimistic about a thing that does not exist. It has almost stopped functioning, my friends. Why? Because of inefficiency in every bureau and in every department of the Government of the United States."

LIKE A FIRE BELL AT NIGHT

Mr. Chairman, the country was aghast at that terrific impeachment of the Government of the United States. It was a passionate, a comprehensive arraignment; and, coming from such a source in such circumstances, it started the nervous system of the Nation as the clanging of a fire bell in the night. Instantly public interest became tense. Immediately it was realized that the Oregon Senator in that New York speech had done what Edmund Burke said he could not do; he had drawn an indictment of a whole people. I say the Oregon Senator had indicted a whole people, Mr. Chairman, because this is a representative Government, equally free from the impedimenta of heredity and the constraints of autocratic power. And if it truthfully may be said that the American people have erected a Government that fails to function in the face of imminent peril, what more accused accusation could be written in the book of fate? If, with good reason, it may be charged that the people of the United States, with their constitutional freedom of speech and of the press, have been so indifferent to their liberties and so insensible of their own security as to commit "every bureau and department of Government" to incompetent hands, would we not better welcome, rather than resist, the invasion of Teutonic Kultur? If what Senator Chamberlain said at New York is true, it denotes the irretrievable breakdown of democracy at a time when only the triumph of democracy in arms may compensate for the glorious oblation of men who have died and men who yet shall perish that heaven may be kind to those who hereafter will inhabit the earth. [Applause.]

ASPERITY! YES

Was any Member of the Congress surprised that the President of the United States pursued the unconventional course of making swift and direct answer through the medium of the public press? I think the country would have been pained and disappointed had not the President, charged with the administration of the Government and the conduct of the war, taken the quickest way to reassure the American people. It was a grave situation that the Oregon Senator had created, one which could not endure hesitation or fine phrasing; and I venture to think the President met the exigency in pretty good degree. Asperity! Yes; there was asperity; but, Mr. Chairman, there come occasions when benignity itself is challenged to aid the right by assuming an aspect of reproof.

The President characterized the extraordinary indictment of the Government by the Oregon Senator as a distinct "distortion of the truth," and for convenient reference I shall here append the statement from the White House:

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT

"Senator Chamberlain's statement as to the present inaction and ineffectiveness of the Government is an astonishing and absolutely unjustifiable distortion of the truth.

"As a matter of fact, the War Department has performed a task of unparalleled magnitude and difficulty with extraordinary promptness and efficiency.

"There have been delays and disappointments and partial miscarriages of plans, all of which have been drawn into the foreground and exaggerated by the investigations which have been in progress since the Congress assembled—investigations which drew indispensable officials of the department constantly away from their work and officers from their commands and contributed a great deal to such delay and confusion as has inevitably arisen. But by comparison with what has been accomplished, these things, much as they are to be regretted, were insignificant, and no mistake has been made which has been repeated.

"Nothing helpful or likely to speed or facilitate the war tasks of the Government has come out of such criticism and investigation—I have not been consulted about them, and have learned of them only at second hand—but their proposal came after effective measures of reorganization had been thoughtfully and maturely perfected, and inasmuch as these measures have been the result of experience, they are much more likely than any others to be effective, if the Congress will but remove a few statutory

obstacles of rigid departmental organization which stand in their way.

"The legislative proposals I have heard of would involve long additional delays and turn our experience into mere lost motion.

"My association and constant conference with the Secretary of War have taught me to regard him as one of the ablest public officials I have ever known. The country will soon learn whether he or his critics understand the business in hand.

"To add, as Senator Chamberlain did, that there is inefficiency in every department and bureau of the Government is to show such ignorance of actual conditions as to make it impossible to attach any importance to his statement.

"I am bound to infer that that statement sprang out of opposition to the administration's whole policy rather than out of any serious intention to reform its practice."

A GROSS PROVOCATION

That is a distressing thing to be said by a man of exalted station about the utterances of a man of a little less distinguished rank. It is a condemnation in tenor and terms that may be justified, in propriety or in fact, only by the extremity of the offense and the indubitable necessity of drastic treatment. In this case was not the provocation inconceivably gross? Did not the sweeping charge of the Oregon Senator asperse indiscriminately the integrity of the administrative officials of the Government and invite popular suspicion and discontent? Was it not, indeed, calculated to create alarm among the timid everywhere and dejection even among the stout of heart who should very naturally impute to the speaker intimate knowledge of every detail in the sum of military preparation?

I can not say how the incident impressed other Members of the Congress, but I certainly experienced at first a feeling akin to personal affliction that the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, without warning or apparent justification of any kind, amid the felicitations and applause of adversary revilers and critics, should thus have bitterly assailed an administration of which he was a part, and, without distinction, have mercilessly pilloried as wretched incompetents grim veterans of the American Army who have spent their lives and expended their energies in the service of the country. [Applause.] And, Mr. Chairman, when an earnest quest for the truth carried me painstakingly to the end of nearly 2,000 pages of responsible testimony only to find revealed the utter insufficiency of proof to sustain the astounding censure distress gave place to amazement, and I wondered whether anything the President or anybody else could have said in resentment would have more aptly depicted the episode than what the President actually did say.

THE RECORD RIGHT

We have been asked to search the record, Mr. Chairman, and it is to the record that I appeal. I have seen it with mine own eyes and with mine own ears have heard it expounded. From the testimony I have turned away, not with tears nor with trembling apprehension for the well-being of my own sons or the sons of other fathers but with a firmer faith in my country, praising God for the quiet courage of the men and the ineffable fortitude of the women of America who are to win this war. [Applause.] And for those who impeach their fidelity and deride their capabilities and seek to decry or obscure their achievements we should invoke the imprecations of every loyal citizen. [Applause.]

"VICIOUS PATHOS"

Were every specification marshaled by the critics of the Government really founded in fact, all of them taken together would not expiate the offense of Mr. Chamberlain's New York indictment. The incontestable facts do not at all justify his conclusions, but he must have recourse to utterly hostile inferences. Take the criticisms, for example, directed against the Ordnance Bureau with respect to artillery supply. The Government is blamed for an alleged shortage of guns and bitterly reproached for its momentary dependence upon our allies in the war. The criticism assumes the guise of pathos when it is said that our own impotency necessitated an appeal to poor, bleeding France for assistance. The United States, we are asked to believe, presents to the world the humiliating spectacle of taking from the depleted stock of a struggling comrade nation. But, Mr. Speaker, the pathos of the illustration but intensifies the vice of it. Who of us is not familiar with the facts? What Member of the Congress does not very definitely know that France is furnishing the American Army with guns, not because we sought to deplete her "meager stores," but because her chosen ambassadors and picked experts asked the privilege of arming our expeditionary force from her oversupplied arsenals. [Applause.] It was the wise thing for France to have proposed and the only effective thing for America to have done. [Applause.]

JOFFRE CALLED TO WITNESS

Many of my colleagues will distinctly recall the memorable evening spent by some of us at the home, in this city, of an ex-ambassador to France when we had the privilege of hearing the accredited military and naval representatives of the French Government describe the situation and tell us what it was necessary for this Government to do. Marshal Joffre, for the army, and the French admiral, for the navy, talked to that company of Congressmen for three hours, telling them, cautiously, of course, what at the moment the finest experts of France were pointing out in elaborate detail to every important bureau of the American War Department. Placidly, and with characteristic military precision, Marshal Joffre warned against the folly of hurriedly attempting

to throw into France an army of untrained and untested American troops. He pointed out how such a thing would violently disrupt trans-Atlantic traffic; how ships thus would be used which might more profitably be devoted to the transportation of necessary munitions and other supplies to the armies of the Allies; how futile and inoperative an untrained army would be in France; how necessarily ignorant even our Regular Army was of modern instrumentalities of war, the character of which was changing even as the war raged. Warfare had been literally revolutionized since the Battle of the Marne, and by those who knew we had to be told the things that we did not know.

All through the French marshal's talk there ran a particular thought as a string through a woven garment; and that was the warning against heedless haste. It was suggested that but a single division of the best-trained troops of the Regular Army should be then sent to France, with a complement of Artillery. This division was there to be divided into two divisions of the French strength for intensive training behind the lines of battle; to be prepared later to train intensively the American troops that should follow. It had not been the plan of our General Staff to send over troops so early. It had taken Great Britain two years to prepare an effective army. But the representatives of the French Government stressed the point that the presence of this small expeditionary force would heighten the spirit of France and correspondingly depress the morale of the adversary. And, oh, how true one part of this at least turned out to be.

The Secretary of War on last Monday told the pathetic story in his masterly statement before the Committee on Military Affairs of the United States Senate. Said he:

"The people of France kissed the hems of their garments as they marched up the streets of Paris; the old veterans, wounded in this war, legless or armless, stumping along on crutches, perhaps, as they went up the streets of Paris with their arms around the necks of the American soldiers. Not a single man in that division was unaccompanied by a veteran. America had gone to France, and the French people rose with a sense of gratitude and hopefulness that had never been in them before." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in order to send even this contingent of troops from our pitiful little American Army it was essential to be assured of guns; and when it was suggested to Marshal Joffre that, having just entered the war, we had not immediate equipment, it was promptly replied that France had an overabundance; that her munition factories had caught up and exceeded the necessities of the French Army; that the gun wastage could not keep her arsenals to capacity; and that France could easily and would gladly supply the American Expeditionary Force. Marshal Joffre even suggested that this were better done by French than by American factories, since it would save the unavoidable delays, the pressingly needed cargo space, the tremendous cost of shipment, and other things which I do not now recall.

WAS CHAMBERLAIN IGNORANT?

Is it possible that the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the United States Senate did not come in contact with the French mission to this country and did not learn from the accredited agents of France the facts which I have here cited? Is it possible that Mr. Chamberlain was not advised of the testimony of General Crozier before the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, in which the Chief of Ordnance, more explicitly than I could hope to do, presented these very facts in evidence to show the reason why France and Great Britain are supplying guns to our Army abroad? Is it because he was ignorant of these facts that he sought to have the country believe our Military Establishment is a myth? Is it because of gross ignorance of the truth that critics bemoan a condition which, in the circumstances, any discerning man must see is of tremendous advantage to France as well as to America? I hope it is ignorance, Mr. Chairman, because I would not like to shock my own imagination with the thought that any adversary of the Government is malevolent enough perversely to employ the fine sympathy of the American people for France in a prejudicial assault on the American Government. Yes; both France and Great Britain are supplying the American Army with guns; we are buying them and paying for them just as France and Great Britain bought munitions from us when they could not get them quickly enough or in sufficient quantities from their own factories. And the fact does not constitute an indictment of this Government. Rather is it a clear index of the purpose and a hopeful sign of the diligence which the War Department is applying to the situation. That the arrangement has worked well is convincingly evidenced by the fact that France and Great Britain have proposed its continuation for the current year, and Gen. Tasker H. Bliss, Chief of Staff of the American Army, has recommended such an agreement to this Government. This does not imply any abatement of our activities in this country, for we have already placed orders totaling \$1,600,000,000.

THE ARMY SUPPLIED WITH ARTILLERY

From it all we may deduce the comforting assurance that the War Department is more concerned to furnish the American Army in France with modern guns with which to train and fight than it is to haggle with ambitious statesmen over the source of supply. The thing which will most interest the American people and from which they will derive the greatest satisfaction is the fact that their Army on the battle front has modern guns—among the best in the world—guns that will destroy the enemy. This being the case, perhaps they may be persuaded to forgive the Secretary of War for getting these guns in the quickest pos-

sible way, at the least possible cost to the Government of the United States, with the least possible disturbance of the plans of the allied nations. And merely because the Secretary of War and his expert military advisers thus used their plain common sense in a perplexing posture of affairs, it is not to be inferred that the Congress of the United States or the people of the country will be induced to credit the wild and foolish charge that the Government has broken down and needs to be frightened to its feet again by the distempered clatter of theatrical public men. [Applause.]

FRENCH OVERPLUS OF ARMS

Here I shall put in the Record a statement by André Tardieu, former French high commissioner, now munition minister of France, showing conclusively how France welcomed the arrangements:

"An important agreement has been concluded between the United States Government and the French high commissioner, M. André Tardieu.

"According to said agreement the American Government adopts the two principal pieces of matériel of French artillery, the 75-millimeter field gun and the 155-millimeter rapid-fire howitzer.

"The expeditionary corps of General Pershing has received from the French authorities, on arrival, its field artillery, its rapid-fire heavy artillery, and its French artillery—which, of course, will accelerate its taking its place in the line.

"At the same time the artillery production in France and in America has been organized so that the American Army of 1,000,000 men which is about to be recruited will receive without delay, as the units are formed, the necessary heavy and light guns.

"The negotiations taken up for the first time at the end of May, between M. André Tardieu, French high commissioner; M. Ganne, chief of war munitions of the high commission; and Brigadier General Crozier, chief of ordnance, were characterized by two ideas.

"On one hand, the American Government wished to adopt the quickest solution in order to realize in the shortest time the complete armament of its forces.

"On the other hand, with great foresight, they attached particular importance to realizing, for the American and the French Armies, called to fight on the same battlefields, uniformity of munitions of such capital importance from a tactical point of view.

"In view of these two desired aims the French high commissioner was able, thanks to the development since 1916 of the machine equipment of our war-munitions factories, to furnish General Crozier with a detailed plan of industrial collaboration, which, by the united efforts of the French and American industries, will assure the complete realization of the American program.

"The double certainty of rapid production and uniformity of munitions decided the United States Government, despite the incontestable value of its own matériel, especially that of the 3-inch field gun, of which the superior qualities are universally recognized, to adopt our 75 and our short 155.

"The negotiations on these lines were rapidly completed; at the end of somewhat over one month they were concluded this week by a complete understanding, fixing the quantity and the price of the matériel to be furnished.

"This understanding, susceptible of important further developments, is a precious proof of the esteem in which the most powerful industrial country of the world holds our engineers and our mechanical constructors. It has also a practical bearing of great value.

"From the military point of view it is evident that uniformity of type of guns and munitions for armies fighting on the same battlefields is an appreciable guaranty of safety and efficiency. The supply and the volume of fire are thereby equally facilitated. Unity results spontaneously from identity of weapons. Finally all tactical results, obtained by the experience of three years of war, are without previous adaptation assimilated by the American Army.

"From the industrial viewpoint the unity of effort created between the manufacturing plants of the two countries will produce happy results without precedent not only during the war but also subsequently. Common action provides the best means of mutual acquaintance and for preparation of the close cooperation which it is desired to organize for the future.

"From the financial standpoint it is possible to hope that the purchase of the United States of French artillery matériel will create an improvement in exchange, which under the existing relations of America and her European allies is as much to be desired by the United States as by France.

"It is also likely that the adoption of the metric system, which has been officially requested by the American Bureau of Standards and which is much to be desired from the point of view of future Franco-American interests, may be thereby facilitated.

"These are, briefly stated, some of the results, certain or probable of the agreement between the French high commissioner and the American Government.

"The dominant note of the agreement lies in the proof it gives of the unshakable resolution of the American Government to achieve in the shortest time the maximum of military strength, and, on the other hand, it proves the intimate and active cooperation existing between the United States and France.

"Mr. Baker, Secretary of War, and General Crozier, Chief of Ordnance of the American Government, have given proof in this case of the broadest spirit of comprehension and decision and

have succeeded in a few weeks in securing for the American troops artillery of the first order.

"Our high commissioner at Washington speaks in unbounded praise of their cooperation with him."

MACHINE-GUN SQUABBLE

Mr. Chairman, in support of the intemperate charge that the Military Establishment of the United States Government is a myth—that it has no existence—a charge contemptuously echoed only the other day by a German military expert in a German newspaper, the controversy over the Lewis machine gun and the Browning gun is revived, and in the very obvious attempt to discredit the Government and to "get Baker" the critics try desperately to convict the Ordnance Bureau of incapacity and the Chief of Ordnance of personal venom. I addressed myself to an examination of the evidence, deeply prejudiced against General Crozier, but there is not one particle of disinterested testimony in the hearings which does not abundantly acquit the Chief of Ordnance of blame. The final decision of the competitive tests between the two types of machine gun was delayed—the critics say inordinately delayed—but General Crozier asserted, and the Secretary of War cheerfully assented, that the latter had full responsibility for the fact, so that the persistent contention that the personal pique of the Chief Ordnance Officer of the Government was responsible for the rejection of a superior gun, immediately available, has no evidence to sustain it. Moreover, the Lewis gun was not a superior gun. The preponderance of expert testimony to the superiority of the Browning gun for American use is overwhelming, and it is upon this fact that the Secretary of War relies to justify his opinion that the delay which was occasioned will be more than compensated by the superiority of the weapon secured.

The best experts are definite and emphatic in their judgment that the Browning is "the best machine gun in the world." The only prop on which the critics seek now to rest their case is the plea that the Lewis gun was immediately available, while deliveries of the Browning gun will be delayed; and they use this broken reed in face of expert testimony to the effect that in tests the Lewis gun "had utterly failed with American ammunition," which has tremendously greater pressure than British ammunition, and in face of the further fact that the Lewis gun was neither immediately obtainable nor remotely available for our operations in France. Indeed, General Pershing sent word from Europe that the Lewis gun could not be used on his front for land fighting, and even the United States marines who went to France armed with this gun were rearmed with a different weapon.

But this is not important, Mr. Chairman, and the furthest thing from my thought is any desire to transfer the rival gun controversy to this Chamber. I pretend to no knowledge of machine guns. The whole point of what I am saying goes to establishing the fact that the Ordnance Bureau of the Government can not be discredited, even in this single detail, when we balance the testimony of experts against the self-interest of disappointed persons and the miserable bias of fretful politicians with a case to make out. One of the ablest arms manufacturers in the United States pronounced Browning as "probably the most remarkable gunmaker in the world," and expressed the belief that this opinion was shared "by every gun manufacturer in the world." So this is the kind of gun and the character of gunmaker with which and whom the Secretary of War dealt.

PERVERTING THE TRUTH

Ah, but, they say, the testimony reveals that but nine Browning machine guns have been made, and the impression has gone abroad that the American Army has but nine machine guns to go up against the millions of Germany. Talleyrand tells us that language was invented to conceal our thoughts. I should hate to regard that as axiomatic. It is, of course, a witty French cynicism. But, at least, we do know that sometimes words are used to obscure the truth or skillfully employed to pervert it. The American Army in France has thousands of machine guns to go up against the enemy [applause]; it is as well equipped with machine guns as any army in Europe [applause]—perhaps better equipped than the German Army. And no set of malcontents should be permitted to deceive the people of this country into the disturbing supposition that our fighting forces in France are suffering in equipment of any kind. [Applause.]

On this very point General Crozier said nearly two months prior to that extraordinary New York speech to which I have been referring:

"I think here is the time to say something which I have not told the committee before in reference to these machine guns. Our number is so small, and the possibility of manufacture in this country was so limited, that when our troops went abroad we made, and were fortunately able to make, the same kind of an arrangement with the French Government with reference to the machine guns that we had made with reference to artillery, and we are getting from them quite a sufficient number of guns to arm our troops over there with the Hotchkiss type of the heavy gun and of the Chauchat type of the light guns."

ITCHING TO "GET BAKER"

All this raucous outcry apparently has its root, Mr. Chairman, in the itching desire to "get Baker." But it can not be done [applause], for the available expert testimony clearly indicates the discernment of the War Secretary. I venture to assert that no civilian could have been got in this country who, as head of the War Department in this emergency, could have exhibited a

broader comprehension of policies or better have absorbed the multitude of details than Newton D. Baker. [Great applause.] It is absolutely convincing that delay, if any, occasioned by the retrieval of machine guns and the selection of the Browning is much more than made up by the vastly superior qualities of the gun accepted. Talk to the contrary is mere inference—attenuated inference, amateur inference. It was not expected that deliveries of the Browning gun could be made before this spring, when they will be made in ample time and quantities to supply our troops as they go abroad. It is by no means clear that haste could have been made had the department accepted the inferior gun; for every available American factory, when we entered the war, was crowded with contract work for foreign governments which engaged its output until past the date of the Browning gun decision.

Experienced arms manufacturers insistently declared that no ultimate delay was involved in the discretion exercised by the Secretary of War under the advice of an Army board of high officers. And, aside from all this catching at pegs, the Secretary of War has pointed out that, owing to the decision, "for cogent reasons," to have the American troops cooperate with the French instead of the British the Lewis gun was not adapted for use by our land forces abroad. No such machine gun as the Lewis gun is used by the French and, as stated by the Secretary of War, it is "highly desirable, for military reasons, that the American Army should be organized and equipped as the French Army is organized and equipped." For aviation use and for training purposes, the Lewis gun has been ordered to the practical limit of available funds and is being made to the full increased capacity of the arms plant executing the contract. But, Mr. Chairman, the thing that can not too frequently be stressed—the real thing that the American people should know and will be glad to find out when we brush away the gossamer of excited declamation—is the solid fact so definitely stated by the Secretary of War last Tuesday, when he said:

"All our units going to France will be completely equipped with what is taken with them and what is secured by them in France, and the organizations in training camps in this country will be supplied with sufficient weapons to acquire familiarity with them before going abroad."

In short, Mr. Chairman, all American troops in France are fully equipped, every unit going to France will be completely equipped, and every organization in training for France will have sufficient guns before going abroad to acquaint it with their use. That is the testimony; and over against it, on a stage set for that purpose, we have only the agitated exclamation of one public man that the American Military Establishment is a myth. [Applause.]

ARMY HAS FINEST RIFLES IN WORLD

And they bring up the old rifle dispute, Mr. Chairman, and hang a complaint on that peg by seeking to have it appear that the Army experts did not know their business. Men like Scott, Chief of Staff at the time; Bliss, next in rank; Crozier, Chief of Ordnance; Kuhne, of the War College; Pershing, on his way to France, were unsafe advisers to the Secretary of War! They agreed without a single dissent, after a survey of the whole situation, to use the American Springfield rifle, and, in conjunction with it, the English Enfield adjusted to American ammunition and modified as to the interchangeability of parts. It was also the unanimous recommendation of the arms manufacturers' experts. Of course, the change in the Enfield rifle took time; but, meanwhile, with 600,000 Springfields and 165,000 Krag's in hand, the Army heads and experts judged that we could better endure the delay than to send our soldiers to France with a rifle dangerously defective—a weapon which Great Britain itself was arranging to radically alter when suddenly overtaken by war, and which had been used chiefly for training purposes since the war began. It seems to be the idea of some distinguished gentlemen that we should have grabbed up any old instruments of warfare and sent a ragamuffin army across the Atlantic instantly to break the Hindenburg line. [Laughter.] They did not want us to have modern rifles, nor did they want us to have the best machine gun in the world. Their impatience ran away with their discretion.

I could wish every Member of the House would read the hearings on this point, that they might comprehend the question from the clear, cogent, conclusive reasoning of men of vision, men of great affairs, men of technical understanding, who know what they talk about when they talk. There was S. M. Vauclain, vice president of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, now a member of the Council of National Defense and chairman of the war industries board. I believe you know him, Mr. Speaker; I think he said you induced him to come to Washington. At all events, he is a manufacturer of long experience and a man of great ability, described at the hearings by Senator Frelinghuysen as the real "driving force" in providing artillery and munitions. It is exhilarating to note his intimate knowledge of what is transpiring and to observe how sharply and completely he routed pertinacious critics of War Department operations.

NO APPRECIABLE DELAY

On this rifle modification matter and the consequent delay charged, Mr. Vauclain was very explicit. He said:

"I consider that the Ordnance Bureau was very wise in taking time to perfect this rifle. I think it is the finest rifle made to-day. I think it is a better rifle than the Springfield."

And, briefly explaining advantages of the change from the Enfield model, he said:

"There is a great objection to using the rim cartridge in the field on account of jamming when you are working the shot in

a rifle. These rifles now have rimless cartridges, the same as used by the Springfield rifle, interchangeable ammunition, absolutely no possibility of jamming in service. Their interchangeability is such that when we were putting English rifles together, if a man put 20 rifles a day together he thought he had done a good day's work. About 10 days ago one of our fitters put 128 of these rifles together, and 97 per cent of them targeted first shot. If this rifle was not of perfect design and perfectly made as to tolerance, it would be impossible for anybody to put 128 rifles together in 10 hours out of a miscellaneous heap of parts; so that I am satisfied that the rifles are an absolutely interchangeable piece of work."

Here I may add that the deliveries of these new-model Enfields for the week ending February 2 were 42,932, and of the Springfield 7,900. And yet these hypercritics tell the country the Ordnance Bureau does not exist any longer.

Frustrated in the obvious desire to prove the inadvisability of the change from the technical viewpoint and "hell bent" on making out a case of disastrous delay, one of the hostile critics of the War Department asked Mr. Vauclain how many rifles would have been produced had there been no change of model, to which the witness made the heartbreaking response, "Not one more than we have to-day." And again and again this great captain of industry, this "driving power" of the Government's artillery and munitions force, vindicated the efficiency of the Ordnance Bureau and confounded his inquisitors.

DRILLING RIFLES

But it is contended that some of the cantonments had not rifles enough with which to train. General Crozier, as I recall, contests this proposition. The Secretary of War was disposed to concede that there was unavoidable delay in deliveries, which had been corrected, however, or was in process of immediate adjustment when Mr. Chamberlain made his fierce attack on the Government by charging that the Military Establishment had ceased to function.

General Crozier in his testimony pointed out that while every man in every camp had not been furnished a rifle, it is not customary for all the men to drill at the same time, and that, for training purposes, rifles could be used over and over again. Of course there was inconvenience. We should have witnessed a miracle had there not been minor troubles and delays of this sort. But would anybody who hears me be willing to say that an inconvenience of this kind, already subjected to remedial attention, could justify the chairman of a great military committee of the Congress in charging before a public audience an utter breakdown of our military establishment? Who of us does not recall that the pictorial papers and magazines of this country for many months after Great Britain had gone to war teemed with illustrations portraying British recruits marching in silk hats, in shirt sleeves, and workman's blouse, and drilling on England's commons with broomsticks and walking canes? Did any responsible public man in Great Britain, because of this, charge that the British military establishment was nonexistent? Mr. Chairman, did the fact here cited betoken incompetence or slothful pace? On the contrary, it seems to me that it signified an indomitable spirit—a spirit that found expression at Neuchapelle and Passchendaele and other battlefields which will literally crowd the glorious pages of history. And I apprehend that the American people will not be dismayed nor agitated nor made afraid merely because at some camps some recruits were a little while without rifles. Many things are required to make a soldier before putting a rifle in his hands, and we would better have been a few weeks without rifles than without men to train in the other minutiae and movements of war.

WHAT THE TRUTH REVEALS

What the American people will desire to know, and what these hostile critics of the Government have been unwilling to tell them, but what the testimony itself abundantly reveals, is that no appreciable time, after our declaration of war, was lost in turning out rifles for the American Army. The people should know that, weeks before Mr. Chamberlain made his monstrous indictment of his Government, General Crozier, Chief of Ordnance, repeatedly testified before the military committees of Congress that "no American troops are being sent to France who have not had rifles which they have been using for some time" prior to sailing. Again he testified that "the troops which thus far have gone to France, and those which will for some time go, are those of the Regular Army and National Guard," for a long time supplied with Springfield rifles for target practice; and then again, with earnestness and emphasis that are perfectly manifest, General Crozier declared on the witness stand:

"I wish to say to you that no United States soldier has been or will be delayed five minutes in reaching the theater of war because of the absence of modern rifles."

THE REASON FOR UNPREPAREDNESS

But, Mr. Chairman, I earnestly invite the attention of the House to this point: Backed by an incontrovertible record of events, I assert that if there was a shortage of modern rifles, or even of dangerously defective weapons, the responsibility is not with the Bureau of Ordnance. I have read in the papers that somebody somewhere suggested that any half-witted American citizen might have foretold that this country would be drawn into the European war. I assume that it was upon this supposition that the Chief of Ordnance in the investigation before the Senate Military Committee was asked what his bureau had been doing from August 4, 1914, when Belgium was invaded. I infer that this question was prompted by the supposition that

any half-witted citizen should have known we would enter the war and, therefore, that the Ordnance Bureau should have instantly increased its activities. I infer that it was upon this theory that Mr. Chamberlain in his New York speech was provoked to put the stigma of utter failure upon our military managers.

I do not agree that any half-witted citizen might have foreseen in 1914 our participation in this tragedy. I disagree for the reason that the major sentiment in this country was against entering the war and the President of the United States, with surpassing patience was ceaselessly endeavoring to avoid the calamity. The Congress of the United States was opposed to war; and we witnessed in this chamber the remarkable spectacle, in 1915, after the *Lusitania* was sunk, of 152 Members of the House so determined to avoid participation in the struggle that they voted practically to abandon the indubitable rights of the country to sail its ships upon the high seas or to prosecute commerce with belligerent or even neutral nations. I disagree, because as late as the closing months of 1916 one of the great political parties of the country, to which Mr. Chamberlain belonged, reelected Woodrow Wilson President of the United States because, among other considerations, he had been wise and brave enough to keep us out of war, and could confidently be relied upon to do all that mortal man might honorably do to avert the horrible affliction. [Applause.] I do not know what was the attitude or what were the utterances of the Oregon critic in the presidential campaign—whether he applauded the President or censured him. But I do know, Mr. Chairman, that if the Oregon Senator in 1914 or 1915 or 1916 had the prescience to foresee that we should enter the war, the weight of his culpability is such as no good citizen would like to endure.

CHAMBERLAIN DID NOT FUNCTION

Why did not the Ordnance Bureau function? Why were we short of modern rifles and heavy artillery? Let the Chief of Ordnance tell the story of how the Ordnance Department of the Government did function to the fullest extent of lawful permissibility. I shall put into the record—for it can do no harm—extracts from General Crozier's testimony bearing on the subject. But in contemplating the sweeping indictment of his Government by Mr. Chamberlain the astounding thing to which I invite your attention right now is the fact that, with all his preoccupation, Mr. Chamberlain did not function. He was and is chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the United States Senate, with access to every particle of available information. In a large sense he held the purse strings upon military expenditures, because the Senate nearly always increases and rarely ever decreases appropriations. For a long time this Government has owned two arsenals, one at Springfield and the other at Rock Island. Ten years before the war the appropriation for small arms in these establishments aggregated \$1,700,000; a year later, \$1,778,000; a year later, \$1,700,000—at a time when nobody in America could have dreamed of war. And yet in 1915, practically two years after Mr. Chamberlain had assumed the chairmanship of the Senate Military Committee, when for seven months war had raged in Europe, the appropriation for small arms had gone down to the pitiful mark of \$250,000, and that, Mr. Chairman, so far as the record discloses, without one word of protest or even admonition from these adversary critics and calamity shriekers. Furthermore, the fires at the Rock Island Arsenal had long been out; how long I do not know. The arsenal at Springfield, where the best rifle in the world is made, was running at one-eighth of its capacity. The war had reached its trench-fighting stage, furnishing a fair inference of a protracted struggle. Kitchener had predicted that it would last three years. Notwithstanding these things, Mr. Chairman, the men who now affect preknowledge of future events did not increase by one dollar the trifling appropriation for small arms but reduced it from the preceding year by nearly 50 per cent. The expert foremen and skilled artisans at the Government armories had been scattered and the forces disorganized and demoralized, so that later, when operations were resumed, the Ordnance Bureau had to get these people back by bidding high against private establishments engaged on munitions for foreign governments. Was Crozier to blame for that? Is this soldier to be assailed and his reputation destroyed by the cruel imputation of inefficiency leveled by the Oregon Senator at this New York meeting against every bureau and department of his Government? I protest, Mr. Chairman, it is not just; for General Crozier, we are told, did not know the truth. The President did not know the truth. Secretary of War Garrison did not know the truth. Tardieu and Lloyd George, great ministers of munitions of foreign governments, Scott and Bliss, Pershing and Kuhne—none of these knew the truth. Only this world-wise Oregon critic knew the truth, and at the critical moment he failed to function! [Laughter and applause.] With a moving picture of America at war before his eyes, with strong conviction in his mind, distressed by his very contemplation of our utter inefficiency, he permitted the small-arms appropriation of the American Congress in the very year that the *Lusitania* was sunk to go down to the contemptible figure of \$250,000!

FUNCTIONED THE WRONG WAY

And, Mr. Chairman, if the Oregon Senator was inspired to make that savage indictment of the Government in his New York speech by the supposition voiced by somebody that any half-witted American citizen should have known as early as August, 1914, that this country might be drawn into the European war, I cite a circumstance now that painfully accentuates his own responsibility for our lack of preparation. In the military appropriation bill which passed the House in 1915, long after the war began,

there was an appropriation of \$50,000 for motor trucks for the Army; but, trifling as was the sum, contemptible as it must have seemed to anyone who was reasonably certain that the United States was on the brink of war, the distinguished Oregonian had it cut to \$25,000! With what result upon our activities at this time the House may judge from this extract from the testimony of Major General O'Ryan, of the Twenty-seventh Division, Camp Wadsworth, who said, in speaking of the difficulties of training down there:

"It is impossible for lack of mechanical transportation. For instance, we have not automobiles enough to haul wood from the depot to get it to our organizations."

And Major General Greble, at Camp Bowie, testified that his division urgently required 245 motor trucks, but had not even 1. It required 46 motor cars and had just 1. The escort wagons, he testified, were drawn by mules, and General Greble added:

"If we do not get those things until we get abroad, why, we won't have trained motormen to look after them."

Talk about functioning! Here is an instance in which the distinguished Oregon critic of the Government functioned the wrong way. [Laughter and applause.] He knew we should go to war—any idiot could have foretold that—but he imagined that the surest and quickest way to win the war was to cut the appropriation for rifles to a negligible sum and have the escort wagons of the Army drawn by mules instead of being propelled by motors! [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, what about the half-witted Congress of the United States—the Sixty-fourth Congress, I mean? Could not we see, as late as August, 1916, that we should inevitably be drawn into this maelstrom of hell-fire? That was only eight months before we actually were drawn into it. Had not we sense enough to see so short a time ahead a thing which our Oregon critic had so surely seen three years before? And if we could, why did we not? Why did we deliberately sit here and make out a war program and make up a war budget to be extended over a period of three years, knowing that we would be at death's grapple in a little more than as many months? If it was so plain that we should go to war at any moment, why did we not compact the whole program into an emergency scheme, making every appropriation immediately available, and starting every factor and every facility of our national being into operation?

VICTIM OF THE THING WE HATE

O Mr. Chairman, the utter proneness of poor human nature to evade just responsibility and to reprehend in others the ugly things that most afflict our own records and dispositions! Why not be strictly honest with ourselves and brutally frank with the country? Let us tell the unhappy truth, which is that, for a century and a half we have emphasized the single warning of Washington against "entangling alliances abroad" and sadly neglected his admonition about a sane preparation against war. We have hated militarism with such a holy hate that now we constrain heaven and earth to avoid becoming its victim. Our aversion to a large standing army is traditional and constitutional—bred in the blood and bone of successive generations. The whole policy of the Nation for all these years has been antagonistic to preparation. No one group of men is to blame. No one political party above another is to be censured. If anything, some of the most frantic protestants against our plight share tremendously the responsibility for our condition, and conspicuous among these culpable critics are the distinguished gentleman who made that New York speech and the distinguished gentleman who led the applause of the unbridled indictment. [Applause.]

A WANTON CHARGE EXAMINED

But because we were unprepared is no reason to infer that we are not being prepared; and being prepared, Mr. Chairman, at a pace that has amazed the European nations in arms. General Crozier's testimony and that of other witnesses shows conclusively that there is no particle of excuse for the charge that the Ordnance Bureau was indifferent to passing events, that it was supine, that it did nothing to anticipate trouble, that it fell down and has ceased to function. The testimony is to the contrary; the facts are the very reverse, and the evidence and ascertained facts together would warrant a characterization of the charge as wanton.

General Crozier declared that prior to the entry of this country into the war "a good deal of thinking was done, and a good deal of discussion had among officers as to the form of expansion in the event of war." A competent officer was "assigned to the task of getting additional personnel, looking up methods, ascertaining the means of getting reserve officers and of listing these officers." Months before the war the Chief of Ordnance "commenced to inventory the manufacturers of the country who would be capable of doing the kind of work required." Drawings were made of the things that would be needed in largest quantities, photolithographed, and sent out from the mailing lists supplied by technical journals. Letters were written to appropriate industries to get their capacity and to ascertain their willingness to accept contracts, and the replies were card indexed for reference when needed. As far back as the summer before the war, General Crozier detailed a West Point officer, momentarily freed from his academic duties, to aid with technical advice the advisory committee of the Council of National Defense in compiling kindred information. Said General Crozier:

"We got some valuable assistance from the General Munitions Board in selecting establishments with which to place some of our

large orders. That was another function of that board—I mentioned one of them in the early part of my statement. Another function was to inform us as to where there might be found people who could probably do our work and would probably be willing to do it—people who had not been in the habit of bidding for Government work, but might have been making shafting and locomotive axles, or something of that sort, which was allied to our work, so that they probably could do ours. Those gentlemen, from their knowledge of the industries of the country, were able in a number of instances to deliver to us supplies of that kind and to save time in opening negotiations with them."

General Crozier and his little staff informed themselves about the troubles of the European nations and studied these problems with a view to the avoidance of mistakes. The artillery supply tables contemplated a much larger proportion of shrapnel than shells; but the blunder of the British in that regard was escaped by reversing the proposition. After funds became available, under our 3-year program, contracts were let as rapidly as plans could be effected. The closed armory at Rock Island, which had been kept closed in spite of Mr. Chamberlain's prevision of war, was reopened, the scattered operatives who could be gotten back were recalled and others secured, and activities at both arsenals greatly increased.

But what did the 3-year plan amount to, Mr. Chairman, to a man who considered as imminent the participation of this country in the war? It was insignificant; it was a mere bagatelle. Prior to 1916 no appropriation by Congress for field artillery was as large as \$3,000,000. In July and August of 1916 Congress, under the 3-year plan, set aside \$16,000,000. But did that reflect the expectation of Mr. Chamberlain or anybody else that we would in a few months enter this World War? The direct, crushing answer to the question is found in the fact that when we actually did declare war, \$171,000,000 was immediately appropriated, and four months later \$225,000,000 was appropriated for field artillery. If \$396,000,000 was required for this purpose when we entered the war, whereas a few months before we made available only \$16,000,000, why did the military genius who indicted his Government in New York stand for this act of imbecility in Washington? He confessedly knew we were going to war; why did he not tell those of us who did not know that we were paltering with a grave question and making ill provision for a desperate situation?

CROZIER'S WARNING UNHEEDED

It takes a great while to build guns; it has taken as long as seven years to design and turn out a great gun in Germany. General Crozier, as far back as 1906, warned the Congress and the country of our utter lack of preparation, and for years successively repeated the warning. In January, 1911, he pointed out that we were "worse off in this matter of field artillery than in anything else," and warned that "in case of an emergency of any importance, the field artillery of the United States would be found positively insufficient." The emergency has come, and not even an appropriation of \$16,000,000 immediately before going to war nor of \$396,000,000 immediately after going to war can provide all the guns we need as we need them. The Congress can not evade its responsibility, and to attempt to shift it to the War Department and thus to discredit by a charge of inefficiency every branch and bureau of the Military Establishment is an unspeakable injustice.

Over against the harsh and cruel opinions of these political critics I give you the judgment of a great business man, whose technical and practical training and familiarity with events render of real value what he says on the subject. Mr. Vauclain, of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, member of the War Industries Board, in his testimony before the committee, said in response to a suggestion that the Ordnance Department is a little too slow and disorganized:

"I have lived with them since the war started and I have not found them disorganized. I do not think we have the maximum of efficiency in any department just at present because all of these departments have had to be expanded so tremendously; but they have maintained an efficiency that has been surprising to me and very satisfactory. I do not think we have a single department, taking them as a whole, that is under 90 per cent efficient. I think when they get their full stride there will be no more efficient organization in the world than we will have."

"If anything, there is ground for commendation for the manner in which the officers in the Ordnance Departments of the Army and Navy have arisen to the situation. It is a tremendous task. It is only those who have lived with it as I have lived with it, day and night, Sundays included—I have given my entire time to it—who can realize what a tremendous proposition it is."

"I do not care how much time has been lost or apparently lost in the first few months, we could not have been possibly any further ahead."

ENORMOUS CAPACITY NOW

There is a great deal more, to the same effect, from this man, described by Senator Frelinghuysen as the "driving power" up there. Mr. Vauclain built for the British Government in this country and operated the greatest munitions plant in the world, and we may put a higher appraisal on his definite judgment than on the sensational clatter of politicians who would turn our attention from the battlefield to the forum—because they stand in the forum. Asked if the Ordnance Department "appreciated the great necessity of speed in replenishing the supply of heavy artillery along the French border," Mr. Vauclain in December said:

"We will have an enormous capacity in that line before we are three months older, and we not only have capacity enough to manufacture all the guns we need for ourselves but to manufacture forgings and other stuff to send abroad.

"At present there are over 600,000 tons of military supplies and of steel forgings lying on the wharves to be sent to France."

I could detain the House with citation after citation from other responsible sources to confirm what Mr. Vauclain says, but what is the use? The Secretary of War himself in his great and inspiring statement last week smashed the line of adverse comment from end to end.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 15 minutes more.

OTHER FALSE CHARGES

Mr. GLASS. Great outcry was raised about the texture and weight of the cloth supplied by the Government to the troops. I assume that this is another thing that prompted the distinguished Oregon Senator to indict the Government before that New York audience as inefficient in every bureau and department. It was said that the wool content in the uniforms had been diminished and shoddy introduced. The testimony established the incontrovertible fact that whereas, before the war, our 16-ounce melton uniform cloth was 75 per cent wool and 25 per cent cotton, it is now 100 per cent virgin wool, and thus that malicious disparagement was quickly disproved. [Applause.]

I assume that another reason for Mr. Chamberlain's sweeping indictment of his Government in New York was the charge that shoddy, or reworked wool, had been introduced into the overcoat and blanket fabrics of the Army. And so it had been; but why did not the critics have the frankness to tell the public that it was done with a view to conserving the wool supply available to this country? When we entered the war there was an embargo on wool shipments from Australia. Our European allies had contracted for large stocks. In this matter, as in others, we entered upon an almost preempted field. It was necessary to be cautious, but the expert testimony is convincing that had there been an overabundant supply of wool the introduction of shoddy into the coarser materials of the Army improved rather than impaired the product. Col. William M. Wood, of Boston, formerly a member of the Council of National Defense, vouched for by Senator Weeks of Massachusetts, as "president of the largest manufacturing establishment in the United States," likewise president of the American Woolen Co., in a letter dated January 28 of this year, says the action of the Government in this particular deserves praise rather than criticism. He says that from 90 to 95 per cent of all the overcoatings made in the world, including some of the finest fabrics, contain a measurable quantity of reworked wool. I shall append the letter of Colonel Wood here, in order that we may put the expert judgment of a great wool manufacturer against the amateur opinion of the men who asperse the Government without knowledge of the things they criticize.

ADVANTAGES OF SHODDY

"The recommendation of the manufacturers committee to the Council of National Defense, looking to the utilization of reworked wool is, in my opinion, worthy of consideration and not to be disparaged, as it has been in some quarters. Reworked wool can be introduced into fabrics which are used for overcoats and blankets so as to improve rather than impair their usefulness. It gives a better fitting property to the cloth, makes a warmer, closer, tighter fabric, provided a judicious proportion is used.

"The manufacturers committee, composed of patriotic and practical men, gave the Government their best judgment, based on the knowledge and experience acquired through years of effort in practical manufacturing, in recommending the judicious use of reworked wool.

"I am willing to venture the statement that in the construction of from 90 to 95 per cent of all the overcoatings made in the world, including some of the finest fabrics, there is used a measurable quantity of reworked wool or shoddy, so that the prejudice which appears to exist against the use of this kind of raw material is unfounded and unjust under modern conditions of manufacture.

"As confirming this, I may mention that all the heavier military cloth used for export in this country under specifications given by their respective Governments contains a large percentage of reworked wool."

DELAY OF CLOTHING

It is charged—and I assume that this furnished the basis of Mr. Chamberlain's New York indictment—that there was delay in the delivery of blouses and overcoats to the cantonments. That is true. General O'Ryan testified that his division, comprising 31,000 troops, had a shortage of 900 overcoats. Other officers testified to similar shortages. Undoubtedly there was delay—provoking delay. But, again I say, it would have been a miracle had there been no delays. In the first place, the estimates were for but 500,000 men, then 1,000,000, then 1,500,000. Contracts were promptly let, and the list of manufacturers secured to make these clothes fills 73 closely printed pages of the hearings. Orders were issued for over 2,000,000 overcoats and from April 1 to December 15, 2,090,000 were delivered or in process of delivery. There was delay, of course, but the critics magnify the fault and never tell the country any of the reasons for delay. They suppress the fact that time and again there were strikes among the mill operatives and the garment makers all over the country; that transportation was congested; and that other unforeseen and

unavoidable things intervened. But, Mr. Chairman, when Mr. Chamberlain made his New York speech, I doubt if there was a cantonment in the United States that was not fully supplied with overcoats and blouses and other necessary equipage. Perhaps by that time General Greble had gotten some motor trucks and could dispense with a few of his mules. So the departments here had functioned and were functioning, and the statement made by the Oregon Senator in New York had little, if any, justification in fact.

THE CAMP DEATH RATE

I assume that Mr. Chamberlain's New York indictment of the Government was founded on the charge that base hospital facilities at the cantonments were incomplete and that the space allowance for the enlisted men was insufficient and that, because of an insufficiency of clothing and because of overcrowding, sickness ensued and the death rate was increased. Of course, it is distressing that our boys away from home should have to die at all; and it is for the very reason that parents everywhere have a keen regard to this situation, and a tender solicitude for their absent sons, that any criticism should have a sure basis of fact and no element of exaggeration. Sadly enough there has been illness in camps, aggravated in some degree by temporary overcrowding. But even this, Mr. Chairman, produced no abnormal death rate. Contrasts are disagreeable and not always fair, but at least some indication as to the utter indefensibility of the attack on the Medical Department of the Army may be derived from the statement that the death rate of the city of Washington is 17 per 1,000 persons between the ages of 20 and 40 years, while the death rate at the Army cantonments has been 8.2 per 1,000; and this rate at the cantonments contrasted with the death rate from disease in the war with Spain is 8.2 as against 20 per 1,000. I do not cite this circumstance with any view to reviving the scandals of the Spanish War, but merely to point out that inefficiency has no politics and the camp casualties of a great war enterprise no party.

FAULTS EXAGGERATED, ACHIEVEMENTS SUPPRESSED

To begin with, the recommendations of the Surgeon General were strictly adhered to by the Army boards in designing the camps, and in the second place the record shows that the instant overcrowding at two or three cantonments was reported, orders were issued to correct the evil by the immediate shipment of additional tentage and the exercise of other proper activities. But if this fact was known, it was carefully suppressed by the critics. Scrupulous pains were taken not to give the country this tranquilizing information and every effort made to agitate the country by magnifying the consequences of these initial difficulties.

QUESTIONS SATURATED WITH PRECONCEPTION

The Surgeon General of the Army is a professional man of international reputation, knowing which the adversaries of the War Department did not dare assail him directly; but it was sought to have it appear that General Gorgas was ignored in all of these matters. I have here in a New York newspaper what I assume is the full stenographic report of the examination of General Gorgas, making five columns of fine print; and I trust the Members of the House will read the testimony and ascertain for themselves whether the spirit of many of the interrogatories reflected a desire to elicit only the truth and all the truth or were saturated with preconception and a desire to reach a fixed conclusion. Let me illustrate what I exactly mean. General Gorgas was asked if he had been "consulted as to the location of these camps," and responded by saying "no." Now, that question suggested two considerations, one related to military ethics and the other went directly to the question of efficiency. Having established an apparent discourtesy to the Surgeon General, what was the next natural question to ask? Should not the Surgeon General have instantly been asked if he approved the location of the camps and if they were in healthy localities? That was the vital point; that is what the people of this country wanted to know. But no such question was ever asked General Gorgas. The direction of the inquiry was instantly shifted, and but for a statement by General Gorgas, voluntarily made later on, nobody could have ascertained from the examination that General Gorgas unqualifiedly indorsed the location of every one of these cantonments as suitable and healthy. [Applause.]

It may be added that in the subsequent examination of the Secretary of War that official declared that a personal representative of the Surgeon General's office was on the Army board of three members which located every one of these camps. The country is made to believe that there was no heat in any of the hospitals at these camps and that patients are exposed to the full rigors of winter, whereas General Gorgas explicitly stated that while the steam-heating apparatus in some of the camps was uncompleted, all of them meanwhile were heated by stoves. And so with the question of pneumonia. The Surgeon General of the Army was asked if the scarcity of clothing and the failure of steam heat had not started the ravages of pneumonia, and he literally startled his inquisitors by telling them that the greatest epidemic of pneumonia he had ever known occurred at Panama, in the Tropics, and that pneumonia was not necessarily produced by cold or exposure.

ANONYMOUS CHARGES CONSIDERED

Let me give the House one other incident of this investigation tending to show the hostile nature of the inquiry and exhibiting the readiness in some quarters to take as a basis of inquiry

anonymous and irresponsible and indeed incredible rumors. When Major General O'Ryan was being catechized this extract from a letter was brought to his attention:

"I have had the privilege of reading a letter to his mother by a neighbor of mine, now a soldier in camp at Spartanburg. While making no complaint for himself, among other things, he writes the following:

"It is very cold here and trench duty has become nothing but needless exposure of the men. The battalion that relieved ours had 29 men frozen in the trenches, mostly from the hips down, but one man had his face so badly frozen so that when they took his helmet off they took the face flesh with it. Two of the men have died and the others are in the hospital."

"If doings like this are whitewashed under General Gorgas's report of 'Epidemics of pneumonia' or if any system of censorship aims to prevent men from protecting themselves from utterly unfit officers by reporting it, it would seem that investigation should not stop until the officers responsible are executed for murder."

General O'Ryan was asked what he knew "about that condition," and with the fine spirit of a real man and a soldier, he made this biting answer:

"I think it is the duty of anybody who can get that letter and can give us the name of that man, to do it, and let us try him." [Applause.]

No such incident ever occurred. General O'Ryan pronounced it the mere gibbering of a letter-writing recruit desiring to pose among his people at home as a hero or a martyr. He stated that, from September 1 to December 22, there had been 14 deaths at the Spartanburg camp, 4 of them were of men in a motor truck struck by a train, 2 from tuberculosis, 2 from diabetes, 4 from pneumonia, 2 from myocarditis. Fourteen deaths in four months out of 31,000 men, which, as General O'Ryan pointed out, "is a health record that is almost incredible." [Applause.] But General O'Ryan's severe denunciation of this wanton rumor is buried in a committee hearing, while these monstrous inventions, with a few pathetic incidents that are true, find their way under sensational headlines to the newspapers of the country.

A HIDEOUS NIGHTMARE FLAUNTED

I wonder if that gruesome fable of men frozen stiff in the trenches of South Carolina was typical of the complaints which incited the Oregon Senator to charge an utter breakdown of the Military Establishment of the United States? If not so, perhaps it was the "confidential communication" that was borrowed by him from another distinguished Senator and which, between the two, was treasured for three weeks in their breast pockets and never brought to the attention of any military authority charged with the investigation of such incidents and the application of the punitive code of the Army. [Applause.] It is strange, Mr. Chairman, that General O'Ryan's frank intimation as to the obvious ethics of such cases did not operate to avert the shocking spectacle involved in the subsequent use which was made of the unhappy episode at Camp Doniphan, where a sick soldier is alleged to have been subjected to cruel neglect, resulting in death. The excuse given for not instantly demanding an inquiry by the War Department, with the object of redressing the fault, is that the letter was "confidential." That plainly is not true. The very text of the letter itself shows that it is not so. The avowed purpose of the letter was to prevent the recurrence of such an incident. It was written to be brought to the attention of the War Department through the medium of a public man of rank and influence. It expressly was not written to instigate or to fortify a theatrical public indictment of the Government as both inefficient and brutal. [Applause.] On the contrary, the writer of the letter categorically disclaims any such belief or desire. It was only after its receipt in Washington that the letter was given a malignant interpretation and devoted to a wanton attack on the Military Establishment of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to think of this episode in a spirit of moderation. It is impossible to speak of it in temperate terms. To take a single pitiful, tragic case, the like of which has not occurred and probably will not occur at any other camp, and without affording the least opportunity of inquiry blazon it in the public prints to affright the minds and wring the hearts of American mothers with the fear that their sons may be the victims of an inhuman military system, is a thing so inconceivably gross as to make one shudder at the contemplation. [Applause.] As the father of sons who wear the uniform of their country, I protest against the flaunting of this hideous nightmare before my fireside; and, in the name of the women of Virginia and the Nation, I repel the evil suggestion contained in this astounding assault upon the military arm of the Government. [Applause.]

WHAT A CONTRAST!

Contrast the spirit of those responsible for this method of attack with the fine sympathy and patriotism of Mary Roberts Rinehart, whose letter to the Secretary of War is an epic. Mrs. Rinehart, once a trained nurse, now a virile author of note, has great familiarity with Army hospital conditions; and, resenting the intimation that the one pathetic incident relied on to stir antagonism to the Government is typical of the general situation at the cantonments, she wrote Mr. Baker, among other things, as follows:

"I do feel that some step should be taken to reassure our women just now. It is only fair to them. It is cruel to allow every mother in the country to judge the medical care that will be given to her boy while in the service because here and there,

in the chaos of our readjustment, men have been given responsibilities they are unable or unwilling to fulfill. That we have such men is more than a national misfortune. That they have been placed in positions of trust is a national calamity. But the mothers of the country should know in fairness to themselves that the number of such inefficient is small. We will not rest, we women, until they have all been removed. But that, I know, will be at once. It must be at once.

"I have a son in an Army cantonment. He enlisted as a private. He would receive, if he became ill, exactly the same treatment as any other enlisted man in our new Army. And I should have not only no hesitation in placing him in the cantonment hospital but I should do it with absolute confidence."

"One hospital I know well. It is typical of other cantonment hospitals. It is under the same Army Medical Department direction as the others, and it is only right to assume that conditions there are representative. The same rules govern all these hospitals. The same sums are spent on them. The same system is followed. The food is the same; the supplies; the medical staff; the nurses.

"And I have never seen a better war hospital than the one at Camp Sherman. I will go further, and say that in its operating rooms, its X-ray department, its eye and ear department, its nose and throat department, its dental department; in short, in its facilities for caring for every emergency and every weakness, it will bear comparison with any civilian hospital.

"And what is true of the base hospital at Camp Sherman is true of the others.

"I have watched the development of the war hospital system from the beginning, when I saw it first on paper in the office of the Surgeon General, up to two weeks ago. I watched because it was a vital matter to me. I had a husband and a son in the service. I am like the other women of this country. I would be content with nothing less than the best. And I feel that we are on the way to the best.

"Faithfully yours,

"MARY ROBERTS RINEHART."

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I fervently pray God, in all my public career, to spare me such a reproof as the letter of that noble woman conveys to those who would prefer to hinder their Government by aspersion rather than to help it by counsel. But, sir, that is the way the inquisition has gone. Every delay, avoidable or unavoidable; every minor blunder, defensible or indefensible; every one of the few pathetic cases of neglect, explicable or inexplicable—all these have been arrayed and tortured into proof of a total collapse of this administration. The idle tittle-tattle of irresponsible camp speculators in this country has vied for grave consideration with the startling impartations of the British prime minister to an itinerant American Congressman abroad who, unable to contain the confidential revelations of the great man, quickly "leaked" in the presence of the Government's adversaries. [Laughter.] We see, too, the trail and hear the lamentations of disappointed contractors, and witness the insufferable spectacle of congressional Johnnie Hooks running through the camp crying, "Contracts! Contracts!" when men are dying on the seas and on the battlefields for human liberty. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

A BIBLICAL ANALOGY

Mr. GLASS. I have several times been told that the severest of these criticisms of the Government have emanated from gentlemen who protest an unaffected devotion to this administration, and by that I am reminded, Mr. Chairman, that once there was a lady in the play who protested too much. It also brings to me a vision of that memorable episode of the field of Gibeon, in the time of David, the King, when Joab met Amassa, whose face he caressed and whose body he despoiled. You remember the story. With the customary salutation of affection Joab, with his right hand, took hold of Amassa's beard and asked: "Is it well with thee, my brother?" And Amassa noted not the sword that was in Joab's other hand; and Joab smote Amassa under the fifth rib and laid his bowels in the dust! I might deduce from this scriptural incident that all salutations of personal esteem are not entirely unaccompanied by danger, but that is not the point of the recitation. The thing that chiefly interests me is the fact that the President of the United States has no beard, but has eyes keen enough to perceive the sword in the other hand of those who would savagely slash him in public rather than confer with him in confidence. [Applause.] The other thing about this biblical illustration which it is worth while to recall is the fact that pretty soon after that left-handed jab on the field of Gibeon Joab himself perished. [Laughter and applause.]

PRODIGIOUS ACHIEVEMENTS

Mr. Chairman, as will have been observed, I have addressed myself so far solely to pointing out and answering some of the criticisms leveled at the Government. I have not intended to imply that no mistakes have been made. I have not meant to say that there have not been delays and inefficiencies and imperfections. There have been all of these, and had there not been the experience of this country in this war would there have been vastly different from its experience in any other war, and vastly different

from the experience of any other country in any war that ever cursed humanity. But I do mean to say, on the whole, that there have been marvelous achievements, and that we have done as well if not better than was thought possible in the circumstances. When I think of the stupendous nature of the task with which this Government was confronted I have literally a feeling of awe, and when I consider the prodigious progress that has been and is being made I wonder how it could have been done. The expansion in nearly every bureau and branch of the Government has been something almost inconceivable. Before the war the Chief of Ordnance had 10 officers on his immediate staff; now he has 700, nearly all drawn from civilian life, and his bureau has 3,000. For five years preceding the war the average expenditure of the bureau per day was \$35,000; to carry out its program now the daily expenditure is \$13,000,000. The office space of the bureau before the war was 15,000 square feet; to-day it is 16 acres. So with other bureaus. In large degree the brains as well as the patriotism of the country have been mustered, and the war machine is getting its head of steam at a tremendous pace.

Some of these civilians who have come here to serve are men of great distinction in business and in the professions, men like Samuel McRoberts, executive manager of the National City Bank, head of procurement, and Guy E. Tripp, chairman of the board of directors of the Westinghouse Co., head of production, all working under the direction of that tested and accomplished soldier, Brig. Gen. Charles B. Wheeler, Acting Chief of Ordnance, with an exceptional record in this country and in our insular possessions, himself surrounded by a corps of splendid young officers who have not their superior anywhere to be found.

There has been lack of coordination; there has been conflict of authority; there have been poutings and bickerings over rank and precedence; but still the machine is driving ahead. Its velocity will not be increased, but rather impeded, by perverse politicians pounding at its vitals as it goes along. [Applause.]

Not until the third year of the war could Great Britain venture to apply partially a conscription law. Not until a few months ago could Canada do it in opposition to the rebellious threat of one of its largest Provinces.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, as I have no more time, may I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin to yield some of his time?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am very glad to yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. GLASS. I thank the gentleman.

It has not been done as to Ireland, and Australia has twice declined to attempt the system. And yet this Republic, with a clear realization of the situation, instantly applied the democratic method of selective draft, and the country responded with unparalleled spirit of patriotism. The million young men marched up and registered for enlistment. Such a thing never happened before in this or in any other country on the civilized earth. Great military cities, known as cantonments, were built almost overnight; and to these, without friction or hesitation, our boys went, offering their bodies and their lives in defense of human liberty. We have sent nearly ten times as many troops abroad as the French and English military missions had expected that we could do in the time required, and we have trained and are training an army far beyond the original estimates. This year we will have in France more than a million men. And what a stupendous work has been done over there in building great piers and wharves and miles of houses for the supply quarters of the Army! Six hundred miles of railroad reconstructed from ports to battle line, and a thousand other great things. Yet our Army is a myth!

Within the time at my disposal it would be impossible to enumerate in detail even the major items of this stupendous Military Establishment. That was done, in masterful fashion, by the Secretary of War on Tuesday of last week, and I wish every American citizen would read that compendium of things which the Government has done to prepare the Nation for this ordeal. And now to have men whose necks are sore from pulling against the tongue end of the war wagon stand up in public places and revile those who have done nothing but go forward is enough to excite popular indignation. Men who obstructed and voted against every shipping measure proposed by the Government have the audacity now to rage against our lack of shipping facilities. Men who wanted to put a stop to the industries of this country and who mercilessly flayed the munition manufacturers of America as murderers now affect alarm and indignation because the Government is not instantly supplied with guns and ammunition. Was it Napoleon or some other great general who said that "An army travels on its belly"? Let me read you this extract from the statement of the Secretary of War last week:

"I want to make but one further observation on this general subject of the Quartermaster and Supply Department. I think it is not unfair for me to say that in the matter of provision of food, no army ever assembled anywhere was fed as regularly, as well, as nutritiously, as appetizingly, as this Army. I think you gentlemen of the committee, and surely the men at the War Department, will agree that, while there have been complaints about other things, the almost unanimous testimony, so far as I know the unanimous testimony of this Army, is that its food has been of the highest quality; that there has been no suggestion of defective quality or insufficiency in the quantity; that its preparation has been of the highest character, and, generally, the very great problem of food supply for this vast and hastily organized group of men has been carried out with most extraordinary success." [Applause.]

What is true of this department is measurably true of nine-tenths of the Army bureaus; yet every branch of the War Department was comprehended in that incredible assault upon the Government of the United States, in which it was proclaimed to the world that the Military Establishment of the country is a myth.

BLOODGUILT

I suppose these expositors of calamity imagine that by these criticisms they wash their hands of the blood of American soldiers! Mr. Chairman, they will wash, and wash, and wash again to no purpose. "The damned spot will not out." Not all the waters of Abanah and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, with those of Israel combined, could cleanse them of the offense nor obliterate the frightful consequences of their heedless speech. The address of the President of the United States in behalf of a just and permanent peace, to reach the German people in uncensored form, must be flung from airplanes at eminent hazard; but these prophets of disaster will have no restrictive audience in the central Empires.

Almost at the very moment that Von Hertling had appointed to state his terms, at a time when internal tumult and doubt and distress, reaching out for peace, were threatening to topple thrones and banish dynasties, Mr. Chamberlain, without warning of any description, projects this astounding attack on the government of his country!

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin has promised me 10 minutes, and with his permission I shall be glad to yield it to the gentleman from Virginia. [Applause.]

Mr. GLASS. That is, indeed, gracious, and I thank the gentleman.

Without qualification of any sort, in unmeasured terms of reprehension, indifferent alike to titled consequence and to subordinate degree, to epaulet or bar, the Oregon Senator comprehended the entire Government of the United States, in all its branches and bureaus, in an accusation of utter impotency! The Military Establishment, he said, was a myth—it was nonexistent! That's what Reventlow and Tirpitz had been teaching. That's the doctrine with which the scornful masters of the German people had been solacing their discontent and quieting their fears of disaster.

How obliged to Mr. Chamberlain and his kindred spirits will the Kaiser and his kindred spirits be for thus publicly confirming their contemptuous estimate of American willingness and American capacity to fight for American freedom? Every soldier in the German trenches will read the amazing indictment; every peasant in the land will know that, speaking from a high and responsible place, charged with intimate knowledge and not inconsiderable power, this Oregon Senator openly proclaimed a shameful breakdown of this Nation in war. By this speech the declining morale of German citizen and soldier will be retrieved; their courage to hold fast and fight on will be inspired; their resolve to dictate terms on a victorious field will be renewed; the struggle may thus be long protracted. Who can not foretell the sequel to this? Thousands of American boys who might have escaped may be maimed in battle; other thousands who might have survived may find their last resting place in the plains of Flanders or on the heights of the Argonne. Yet these mad soothsayers of evil, with dramatic unction, imagine that they are acquitted of bloodguiltiness! [Applause.]

THE REAL VISION

Why may we not, Mr. Chairman, have an end of these bickerings, these petty divisions, these perverse attempts to retard the Government in its great and pressing enterprises? Why may we not, in the place of these, bend every effort toward a unity of spirit and purpose to win this war? I have in mind an incident which I shall remember to my dying day, and I could very earnestly wish that I possessed the facility of speech impressively to depict it to the House. When the Congress had under consideration the selective draft bill the governor of my State came to Washington for an interview with the President to protest against requiring Virginia boys to be drafted, instead of permitting them to volunteer. He also desired that State military units with a history and traditions dearly cherished should be permitted to retain their identity. A kinsman of J. E. B. Stuart, the greatest cavalry leader of the Confederacy, the Virginia Governor, with all the sentiment and tenderness of an ancient Commonwealth in his vision, presented his case to the President with pathetic earnestness. When he had finished, the President, touched and gravely considerate, told Governor Stuart that the one thing we most needed to realize just then was the fact that this is a Nation. It is not Virginia's war, he said, nor New England's war; not a war of the East or of the West or the North or the South. It is America's war. There should be intermingling of troops from all the States. We should submerge provincialism and sectionalism and party spirit in one powerful flood of nationalism, which would carry us on to victory. The vision as the President saw and interpreted it was full of heart and inspiration.

And, Mr. Chairman, why may it not be so? Why may not the fathers and mothers of sons who are going across the seas to fight the great battle for freedom have the precious privilege of feeling that their boys are flanked on either side by a brave American comrade? What matters it whether he be from Massachusetts or Virginia, from Maine or Mississippi, from the Atlantic seaboard or the Pacific, from the Lake region or the Gulf, just so he be a true American soldier, willing to die for his comrades and his country. [Applause.] And when in the providence of God they shall come back and march in grand review, why may

not all of us praise Heaven that, since they equally shared the perils of the struggle, equally they shall merit the honors and gratitude of this great United Nation? [Great applause.]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14675) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, the pending question being the amendment submitted by Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas, which was, at the proper place in the bill, to insert:

There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000,000 (in addition to such sum as may be or may become available through voluntary contributions), to be immediately available and to be expended by the American National Red Cross for the purpose of supplying food, medicine, medical aid, and other essentials to afford adequate human relief in the present national emergency, to persons otherwise unable to procure the same. Any portion of this appropriation unexpended on June 30, 1932, shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I offer for the RECORD certain telegrams from Michigan bearing on the pending amendment and ask that they may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegrams will be received and printed in the RECORD.

The telegrams are as follows:

LANSING, MICH., January 17, 1931.

HON. A. H. VANDENBERG,
Senate Office Building:

I do not think it possible for Michigan communities to raise funds for drought relief. Michigan suffering from unemployment and all agencies and individuals are being called upon for immediate local relief.

R. H. SCOTT.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., January 17, 1931.

Senator A. H. VANDENBERG,
Senate Office Building:

Michigan cities, counties handling own difficult problems, but believe will meet Red Cross call, as always, unless it appears Government will duplicate. We here believe Federal charity wrong theory and vicious tendency as substitute local responsibility and general charity.

A. L. MILLER.

ESCANABA, MICH., January 17, 1931.

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate:

Mayor of city, county officials, and myself feel that Michigan communities already overburdened caring for own unemployed and urge Federal appropriation to meet Red Cross emergency.

JOHN P. NORTON.

SAGINAW, MICH., January 17, 1931.

HON. A. H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate:

Think Saginaw can raise its Red Cross quota. Feel, however, that if Congress is going to provide anything for drought sufferers it should assume whole job, as local communities all having difficulty in taking care of their own charity and unemployment problems.

R. PERRY SHORTS.

FLINT, MICH., January 17, 1931.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
Michigan Senator:

Michigan communities will find much difficulty in raising quota. I believe Federal aid will be necessary but not put forth until other sources are exhausted.

J. R. TAYLOR.

JACKSON, MICH., January 17, 1931.

Senator A. H. VANDENBERG:

Telegram to mayor referred to city manager and president local Red Cross. Would advise Federal appropriation to Red Cross. Citizens of Jackson have responded with \$200,000 for local relief to unemployed. Local drive at this time for additional contributions not advisable.

W. B. HODGES, City Manager.

SAULT STE. MARIE, MICH., January 17, 1931.

HON. ARTHUR S. VANDENBERG,
Senate Office Building:

After as complete inquiry as circumstances permit, it is my judgment that local Michigan communities can not raise their Red Cross quotas, and that supplemental Federal assistance is

not only advisable but vitally necessary. While this chapter immediately forwarded full quota from funds on hand, I doubt if we could have raised 25 per cent by the ordinary methods.

ROBERTS P. HUDSON.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, it is always extremely difficult to speak in opposition to a measure that will relieve human suffering. One's motives are sure to be questioned and one is likely to be accused of partisanship. Nevertheless, this is a time when one must consider very seriously, it seems to me, such a departure from our general practice as is suggested by the pending amendment. There is no question that there is very great suffering throughout the United States, due in part to unemployment and in part to the drought. There is no question that in some States there is very great need for outside assistance, the entire State, as I understand is the case in Arkansas, being so hard hit that it can not possibly get along without outside assistance. I understand that is the case in other States.

It has been our practice in cases of great emergency and of suffering, of hunger and cold, where there is urgent need for food and clothing and shelter and medicine, to take care of these situations through voluntary gifts, generally through the Red Cross. In war time we do not appropriate all the money that is needed to care for soldiers at the front or in the hospitals. We have permitted a very large part of the money needed to be raised by voluntary subscription through such organizations as the Red Cross, Knights of Columbus, Salvation Army, and others.

I take it that the reason for that is that there is a certain amount of satisfaction that comes from voluntarily giving to the relief of suffering. Another reason is that it has always been considered a bad policy for the Federal Government to relieve acute suffering which should be and generally gladly has been taken care of by voluntary contributions through the Red Cross.

It appears that the Red Cross has, perhaps, been a little slow in getting started, in view of the widespread nature and intensity of the suffering. The Red Cross has frequently been referred to in rather slighting terms during the debate by reason of the small amount of money allotted for meals or by reason of its failure to appreciate the nature of the disaster and the widespread need for help. However, no one can claim since the Hon. John Barton Payne, chairman of the Red Cross, has issued his call for \$10,000,000 that the Red Cross no longer appreciates the intensity of the need and its immediate and urgent character.

It was said on the floor of the Senate yesterday that the passage of this appropriation of \$25,000,000 would not in any way interfere with the raising of \$10,000,000 for the Red Cross by voluntary contributions. Mr. President, in opposition to that view, I should like to ask that there may be read at the desk an editorial appearing in this morning's New York Times.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[From the New York Times of Saturday, January 17, 1931]

URGENCY FOR THE RED CROSS

Officers of the American Red Cross reported to President Hoover yesterday that the special appeal for \$10,000,000 is hampered by certain public misunderstandings. One of them relates to the proposal in the Senate to appropriate \$25,000,000 to be distributed to families left in desperate need by last year's drought, either through the Red Cross or direct by a Government agency. This uncertainty is said to be slowing down the filling of the various Red Cross quotas as assigned. Another hindrance grows out of the idea that the Red Cross has a very large reserve fund, upon which it is unwilling to draw for this particular object.

This matter was referred to in the Senate on Wednesday by Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, who spoke in a vein not at all hostile to the Red Cross but as one desiring information. In fact, all the necessary details are given in the annual report of the American Red Cross for the year ending June 30, 1930. There it is shown that the Red Cross has an endowment fund of over \$6,000,000 and also possesses a reserve in securities, on which interest of \$1,178,377 accrued within the year. But it is distinctly on the basis of such assets and such an assured income that the Red Cross was able to put into its budget for the current year a sum of \$5,500,000 for "relief in disasters." In other words, it must be prepared to move quickly to meet an unforeseen emer-

agency. For special instances of calamity like the Florida hurricane, the Texas tornado, and the Louisiana flood it makes special appeals and receives special contributions. But for the steady conduct of the great and indispensable work it must have a reserve fund and a revenue which it may instantly draw upon as the need arises.

At present such a need has arisen, both urgent and on a scale too great for the ordinary resources of the Red Cross. It asks for \$10,000,000, which its own investigators and the expert advisers of the administration at Washington believe will be sufficient. The sum should be quickly provided. The relief which it will assure can best be administered by the Red Cross. To wait for Congress possibly to make an appropriation would be a double mistake. It might lead to delays which would intensify the suffering. Besides, it might bring about extravagant and haphazard expenditure of money from the National Treasury. This latter of itself is a mischief that ought to be avoided.

Mr. Hoover has taken the right position. The emergency calls for a new demonstration of the ready flow of private benevolence in the United States. It is for the American people, not for Congress, to provide whatever may be needed to keep the victims of last summer's drought from the peril of destitution or actual starvation. There is no doubt that the thing can be done if it is once made clear in the public mind that it ought to be done and that the Red Cross way is the right way. Such an appeal to American generosity has never been in vain, even when it was made for the children of misfortune in other lands. To-day gifts are asked for our own kin. They should be immediate and large so that the amount requested may be quickly and fully subscribed.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Is it not possible that in this particular emergency we have a different problem to deal with than that involved in the appropriation of money to provide relief in the case of a local disaster? There is now such widespread unemployment and distress that the situation has become truly national in its aspects. What I have seen in my own community gives me an idea of conditions throughout the whole country. The people of New York City have contributed very liberally, I think, for local relief—about \$8,000,000—but, in addition to that, the relief committee of that city have asked the board of estimates to appropriate \$10,000,000 from the public funds. This indicates that perhaps the people of New York, rich as is that city, have gone about as far as they can go in contributing voluntarily for the relief of the situation.

I share with the Senator the desire not to embarrass the Red Cross in its present or future appeals, but I do believe that we are confronted by a problem so great and a distress so widespread that it is impossible to handle it by the ordinary processes and operations of the Red Cross. Does not the Senator think that there really is a distinction between the widespread, universal distress of the present day and the localized distress, which is caused by drought, cyclone, or flood, or some other localized occurrence?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, it is possible the Senator is correct; I confess to being in some doubt about it, because of the very widespread nature of the suffering; but I should like to call attention to one or two of the sentences in the editorial in the New York World which was printed in the RECORD yesterday, in which the editor of the New York World says:

The question really is one of principle and precedent, and the answer is not dependent on the degree of one's sympathies with the distress in the drought-stricken States. According to the most authentic reports, the suffering in this area is serious, and the need of relief is urgent.

He goes on to say:

It should be noted that Federal aid to the extent of \$45,000,000 has already been voted. This will take the form of loans to farmers for the purchase of seed, fertilizer, animal feed, and other supplies needed to make a new crop, and the purpose is to help the farmers reestablish themselves as producers. It is a far cry from this to a system of direct relief through the Government's supplying of food. The principles involved in the two cases are wholly different.

I should like to call the Senate's attention particularly to the next sentence:

Once the Federal Government embarks on a program of supplying its needy citizens with food, the demands which may be made upon the Treasury for such a purpose will be practically without limit. The Government can be no respecter of persons.

If the drought sufferers are the victims of conditions beyond their control, so are the idle coal miners, and so, for that matter, are the four or five million unemployed throughout the country. If the Government feeds one group, it should feed all, and once it has embarked on such a policy the politically minded lawmakers will never permit its abandonment.

The experience of European governments with the dole and in past years the experience of some of our American cities with public outdoor relief afford ample warning of what is likely to follow from the adoption of a policy of this sort by the Federal Government. What is designed as an emergency measure will develop into a permanent system, imposing a constantly heavier burden and tending to perpetuate the very conditions it was created to relieve.

Mr. President, I was struck very much yesterday with the repetition in a number of the speeches of those in favor of the amendment by a statement which is directly contrary to that which is purported to have been made by President Grover Cleveland when he said that the people should support the Government and not the Government support the people. It seems to be taken for granted, in much of this debate, that it is the duty of the Government to feed its citizens when they are starving, to clothe them when they are naked, to provide shelter when they are without homes. That, Mr. President, has not been the policy of the United States Government except in rare instances, in isolated cases of very great suffering, such as were put into the RECORD the other day by the Senator from Kentucky. But we have never had any measure quite so far reaching as this, nor one going so directly to the heart of the matter of what is really a dole of \$25,000,000. We are asked to do that which the Roman Republic did when it gave bread to the hungry crowds of Rome; we are asked to do that which every government is asked to do by its citizens when they are in distress. It may be that it is the right thing for us to do.

I have the very highest regard and the warmest respect and admiration for the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], who offered the amendment, and therefore I have hesitated to say anything against it; but, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] on yesterday, during the course of his remarks, implied that the proper thing to do is not to ask people to give voluntarily to relieve the suffering, because in many cities they can not afford to give, they are already bearing all the burden they can carry, but the proper course to pursue is to take the money out of the Public Treasury and make the rich people who pay the surtaxes pay for it. As a matter of fact, of course, the surtaxes paid by the very wealthy are only a small part of the taxes raised which go into the Treasury out of which the \$25,000,000 will come.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BINGHAM. I will yield in just a moment. The suggestion is made, instead of asking those to contribute who can afford it and who are touched, as we are all touched, by a feeling of sympathy and a desire to relieve suffering, instead of giving them an opportunity to experience the joy and pleasure of contributing voluntarily out of what they can afford, or sometimes what they can not afford to give, that we lay the burden on all the people of the United States, irrespective of whether they desire to give or not or whether they can afford to give or not; for there is no question that when we take \$25,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States it is only going to be put back by taxation that will eventually reach every man, woman, and child in the country. It is a truism that taxes are paid eventually by all, even though some may pay more than others.

After all, Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BINGHAM. I will yield in just a moment. After all, Mr. President, is it not better for us to follow the traditional American procedure of appealing to the generosity of the American people to give voluntarily what they are willing to give toward relieving suffering; according to them the satisfaction of knowing that their money is going directly for

relief, and letting them experience the joy that comes from giving, than to force them by taxation to pay something which many of them would be glad to pay voluntarily, but also to force all the people to bear their share, whether they can afford to do it or not? It has been said that "It is more blessed to give than to receive," and that has never been questioned; but I have never heard that "It is more blessed to pay taxes than to receive a dole."

That is the essence of the matter, Mr. President. The Red Cross is just beginning a widespread campaign to raise \$10,000,000 to meet the situation which has now arisen. Would it not be better to see whether the people of this country will not, as they always have done before, respond generously to this request of the Red Cross than to start a gigantic project of this kind of taxing the entire people for the relief of those who are unfortunate instead of permitting the people to give voluntarily for relief, as the American people always have done?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have some sort of recollection that the Senator two or three years ago introduced a bill for the relief of the starving and hurricane-distressed people of Porto Rico. Is not that a fact, and did not the Government appropriate that money upon the Senator's bill?

Mr. BINGHAM. Not in this way, Mr. President. The money was not given for food. I am glad the Senator has brought up that matter, because that relief measure in Porto Rico is the kind of relief which we have given in the \$45,000,000. It was chiefly for loans to planters whose plantations had been destroyed; and I have no objection whatever to loans being given liberally to the farmers, as is done in the \$45,000,000. In addition to the loan money, there was \$2,000,000 for building schools which had been destroyed, and for the construction of roads. There was not one penny for food. The starving people of Porto Rico were fed by the Red Cross, through voluntary gifts, until such time as they could begin to earn some money to buy their own food.

I am glad the Senator brought up that matter, because there is a very great distinction between what is proposed here and loaning money to people who can not borrow it at the banks, due to the fact that their credit has been destroyed and their property destroyed, to be repaid later on. That no one objects to. There is a very great difference between what is proposed here and making appropriations for building roads. The Senator himself has favored and furthered the spending of millions of dollars for roads at this time, in order that many people might be employed; and no one objects to that. That is all that we did for Porto Rico. We did not give one cent directly for food, or directly for shelter, or directly for clothing or medicines.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not sure, but my recollection was that food was included in the Senator's bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, no, Mr. President. There was not one cent in that bill for food or medicine. It was for loans to the farmers and the building of schools and roads and for operating the relief.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not the bill before me, but I will look at it in a moment.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am familiar with the bill. I had a good deal to do with it, as the Senator says.

Mr. McKELLAR. Aside from that, however, the Senator will recall that several years ago we made an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for the starving people of Europe. Did the Senator disapprove of that bill?

Mr. BINGHAM. I am glad the Senator has brought that up, because in my mind there is a very great and fundamental difference, as was pointed out in this editorial in the New York World, between making a generous present of food for people in a foreign land who are not voters, and who can bring no pressure on politically minded lawmakers to repeat that indefinitely, and doing it for our own constituents, our own citizens.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. NORRIS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. One at a time, please.

Mr. BINGHAM. I should like to finish the sentence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. BINGHAM. I agree that our sympathies are aroused more readily, and should be, for our own people; but it seems to me the way to meet that is the way we have nearly always met it, through the Red Cross, through voluntary contributions, and not by general taxation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky permit me to propound a question to the Senator from Connecticut?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield for that purpose?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Connecticut says we ought not to appropriate money to buy food for our own constituents, because our constituents have the right to vote, and therefore may demand a repetition of our generosity or vote against us, and that that objection, of course, does not apply to furnishing food to Russians, who can not vote here.

Under this \$45,000,000 appropriation we are providing funds to buy feed for mules; and while mules do not vote, the owners of the mules do vote. Is not the Senator afraid that if we appropriate money to buy feed for mules, the owners, being our constituents and having a right to vote, will demand a repetition of that, because of their voting privilege?

Mr. BINGHAM. Undoubtedly they will. They always have.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators answering questions and asking questions should rise to their feet. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before I begin what I have to say, I desire to have read from the desk an editorial in the Baltimore Sun of to-day on the subject now under consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the editorial will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of Saturday, January 17, 1931]

PEOPLE STILL STARVE

Chairman Payne and other officials of the Red Cross yesterday reported to President Hoover that they were embarrassed in their efforts to raise \$10,000,000 additional for relief of drought sufferers because of the bill pending in the Senate to appropriate \$25,000,000 as a food loan. We suppose Senator Robinson and the others interested in that measure will say that they have been deliberately hampered in passing it—after the facts as to the need for a sum vastly greater than that now in the possession of the Red Cross had been belatedly admitted by that body—by the sudden decision to appeal to the country for \$10,000,000 in popular subscriptions.

If either President Hoover or Chairman Payne is surprised by the news that the conflict over how to provide money for relief endangers the provision of adequate money from any source, one can only wonder at their slowness on the uptake. You have, plainly before the eyes of all, first the fact that Mr. Hoover and Mr. Payne underestimated the need. You have next the fact that when they got around to agreeing with Senators about the reality and extent of the need, they suddenly called for a Red Cross collection that would give that organization three times the sum it only lately said was necessary. You have next the fact that Senators, who had long insisted upon the gravity of the situation, continued to argue that a Federal appropriation was the only sure remedy. And you have, finally, the fact that, in this confusion of policies in Washington, people in the big cities naturally must be hesitant about the outcome of the fight between White House and Senate, and, since they have charity problems enough of their own, inevitably will be slower to respond to the Red Cross than ordinarily. The dispatches read in the Senate yesterday from Spokane and Tacoma, saying they could not help the Red Cross and their own sufferers, are perfectly natural products of the situation.

The Sun repeats the suggestion it made yesterday, that political jealousies, pride of opinion, and considerations of prestige be cast aside by the great men in Washington, and that Mr. Hoover sit down with Senator Robinson and his associates in the fight in

the Senate and come to an agreement as to how the money is to be got. People are starving. And while they starve Washington is making a mess of the work of relief by turning the question into a political tug of war. Our own belief is that a food loan should be passed. The conditions now admitted by Mr. Hoover and Mr. Payne are such that a Government food loan is obviously the most expeditious means of relief. And, in view of the charity problems the big cities have of their own, it is the one sure means. But any method, agreed upon and passed by all, is better than the present muddle. That is tragic and close to disgraceful.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think the editorial in the Baltimore Sun expresses the real situation. It lays upon Congress the responsibility of an immediate duty, more to my satisfaction, at least, than the editorial in the great New York paper for which we all have the greatest admiration, the New York Times.

It is not my purpose to criticize anybody in connection with this whole program; but in view of the fact that the article read intimates that Judge Payne has reported to the President that the pendency of this amendment is handicapping him in obtaining the subscription of \$10,000,000, I wish merely to call attention to the history of this legislation.

In the first place, I am unable to understand how up to this date it could have handicapped him very much, because the Red Cross drive is only two days old; and I doubt whether the success or failure of any experiment of two days in the effort to raise \$10,000,000 can be attributed to any amendment that may be pending in the Senate of the United States.

I have for many years known Judge John Barton Payne, and have admired him. I do yet. I knew him when was the attorney for the Railroad Administration during the World War, when the Government was operating the railroads of the country. I knew him later, when he became the Secretary of the Interior under the administration of Mr. Wilson; and I have known him in the capacity of chairman of the American Red Cross. I not only have the highest regard for Judge Payne's character, his integrity, and his ability but I have the highest regard for his public service. I wish now, on this occasion, to reiterate what I have privately and publicly said on former occasions—that I regard Judge Payne as one of the outstanding public-spirited men of our country, willing and able, fortunately, to devote his life to the welfare of his country without regard to financial compensation.

But, Mr. President, because the Senate for nearly six weeks has made an honest effort to obtain a modest sum of money for the relief of suffering in the drought area, it is rather difficult to understand how it can be seriously contended that the pendency of this particular amendment, which is the third which the Senate has attempted to pass over a period of six weeks, is handicapping a campaign on the part of the Red Cross, that has lasted only two days, to raise \$10,000,000.

In the literature that was promulgated upon the inauguration of this campaign it was stated that the reason why it had not been done earlier was because the facts were not known. Mr. President, I have here a telegram from the chairman of the drought-relief committee in the State of Kentucky appointed under the program of the President of the United States in the early autumn of last year.

That telegram is dated November 26, 1930, and contains the copy of a telegram which he on that day sent to the President of the United States outlining in detail the needs of the situation in the State of Kentucky, suggesting legislation which ought to be adopted, some of which was adopted in the form of the public-improvement appropriations which we passed before the Christmas holidays, but which, I am informed, has not yet begun very successfully to operate in the employment of unemployed men or in the restoration of prosperity.

Mr. President, in the eastern section of Kentucky, which is known as the mountain district, there is a very public-spirited woman who is operating what is known as a voluntary nursing service. I desire to read a few paragraphs from a letter she sent to me dated January 3, because it depicts the condition which not only exists there now but

which existed early in the autumn, and which was called to the attention of the Red Cross by the same Mrs. Breckenridge, who is the head of that nursing service. She said:

MY DEAR SENATOR: I want very much for you to know the conditions prevailing in southeastern Kentucky at the present time. Our organization is covering over 700 square miles in Leslie, Clay (along Red Bird River), sections of Bell, and the edge of Perry, from nine nursing stations. We have 27 nurses in the field, a physician, a dentist half the year (in cooperation with the Kentucky State Dental Associations), hospital and surgical care. Our nursing stations are distributed over this territory and our nurses get about on horseback.

The reason I am telling you all of the above is by way of explaining that we know intimately the families of our more than 8,000 patients and the territory in which many thousands of Kentuckians are living under conditions that are at present pretty desperate. We have had a house-to-house survey done this autumn of nearly 900 families, by a man named Lee Morgan, one of our foremen, who is a very responsible person. Our own secretaries have tabulated his returns. We have checked up on the exact number of bushels of corn in each family, the number of people in the family, when they will be out of corn, whether there is a cow or a mule, and if there is any other means of livelihood, such as a pension.

Now, the result of this survey shows that 13 per cent of these people have no food whatever at the present time. Fifty-five per cent will be entirely without food for themselves and their stock between now and the spring. The remainder have enough, but so few have a surplus that the necessity of helping their destitute neighbors is going to make some of the rest of the population very close to the hunger level themselves. I personally know many of these families, and I know there is nothing whatever in their cabins at the present time. In giving Christmas to over 4,000 children (the children we are carrying for medical and nursing care in their homes), we always give shoes to those that are actually barefoot. This year between four and five hundred children had no shoes at all. When there isn't the money for food, of course there isn't the money for clothing.

Now, Senator BARKLEY, the drought has brought the condition on, for ours is a population, as you know, which has always been self-supporting, on a meager basis, but always self-supporting. The drought has done it in two ways: First, in taking half the crop in a country where there is rarely ever a surplus; second, in not providing water in the rivers to carry out the rafts of timber, which is the mountains one cash crop. These rafts are now lying in the pools or on the bars of the river, and tied up in them lies whatever money would have come to the mountains this year.

Now, I reported all these things early in the autumn to the American Red Cross, and they have been splendid. They have shown great and kind interest. They have sent representatives in, who are making headquarters there at present, and who will, I hope, arrange to give what is necessary to these families to enable them to sustain life until summer. I was discussing the matter to-day with Doctor McCormack—

Doctor McCormack is the State health officer—

and he thought that you ought to know exactly what the situation is. In other words, quite plainly and bluntly and frankly, some hundreds of families, to my personal knowledge, in southeastern Kentucky face actual starvation this winter unless the matter is handled by the American Red Cross. The Red Cross is, as you know, using up its own surplus to meet the drought demands. I don't know how these things go in Washington, but the Government seems to be appropriating a good deal of money one way or another. It seems to me it should give the Red Cross whatever it needs to put over this program and the same program in other sections, if they are as bad as ours. I believe that the Red Cross would distribute some warm clothing also if it had the funds to do so, and that is needed second only to food.

Isn't it almost incredible, Senator? I was in northern France just after the German evacuation, and went in with Miss Anne Morgan's committee, but the economic condition there was not as bad as it is to-day in the Kentucky mountains. There was machinery to get food in to the population, and they were not allowed to get as close to starvation as our American citizens are being allowed to-day, through no fault whatever of their own.

Mr. President, that letter is from one of the most public-spirited women in the State of Kentucky, known throughout the length and breadth of the United States for her devotion to the welfare of her people.

I have a letter here from Breathitt County. Breathitt County during the World War sent to the Army of the United States enough volunteers to make it unnecessary to draft a single soldier in that county to fill up her quota as a part of the American expeditionary force. Enough of the stalwart young men of that county, located in a section where will be found the purest strain of Anglo-Saxon blood to be found in the United States, volunteered, so that the draft law was not called into execution in order to raise the quota of soldiers of that county to supply the Army of the United States. Yet I have received a letter from the

county judge of that county inclosing a copy of a letter written by him to Judge John Barton Payne, chairman of the American Red Cross, from which I wish to read:

Having assisted in the organization of a Red Cross unit recently for my county, and being county judge of this county, and having made a complete survey recently and knowing its present conditions, considered it my duty to write you this letter.

First, I wish to call your attention to the fact that this is a mountainous county, with a large portion of its surface untillable, and farming, even under the most favorable conditions, is unprofitable and gives a very poor means of livelihood. There being no coal operations worth mentioning, and even those found are now practically dormant, and no other enterprises furnishing labor worth while in the county, and our crops being destroyed by the drought, or practically so, renders the conditions pathetic.

The school teachers in the rural sections are closing their schools on account of children being unable to attend for want of clothing. In fact, many teachers are making an effort to find clothing for their pupils and continue their schools. The merchants have become so drained of their capital in their efforts to give relief that the mercantile business has become practically bankrupt and but little more can be expected from that source. To add to our dilemma a local bank in this city has failed and thus goes hundreds of thousands of dollars of our money, and holding mortgages on the homes to a much larger amount, making the loss of these homes almost inevitable.

He goes on to say what they have tried to do through a local organization of the Red Cross and the Kiwanis Club. He shows in this letter that they have exhausted every dollar they can contribute out of the county treasury for charitable purposes under the law, and that they have been trying for a year to raise \$29,000 to pay a deficit in the county treasury. They have not been able to obtain any amount of money to pay that deficit, and the warrants which are being issued by the county treasury for the purpose of purchasing food and clothing for the starving people of that county are not being accepted by merchants because of their known inability to redeem them when they become due.

Yesterday I received a letter from the county judge of Ballard County, down on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, calling attention to the fact that because of the levees which have been constructed by the United States Government on the opposite side of the river rich and fertile lands have been overflowed in that county until the farmers have been driven out from them, and in spite of the efforts of that county, through its treasury, to bring relief to these hungry and starving people, they have exhausted their resources and are depending upon outside assistance in order to prevent hunger and starvation.

I have a letter here from the county of Calloway, in the old congressional district I represented for 14 years in the House of Representatives, from a dentist who lives there and who has made it his business to become acquainted with the conditions in that county. He says:

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to you because I am amazed at the reasoning used by seemingly a large number of our Senators and Representatives, and am hoping you can give or get an explanation.

When Belgium had hungry men, women, and children the Congress of the United States set aside millions of dollars for their relief and put Herbert Hoover in charge of administering the relief. When German children were hungry and cold millions were sent to feed and clothe them. When Russia had suffering and famine the same thing was done, and in none of these instances, so far as I have been able to discover, was anything said about a mortgage on their crops, property, or any of their possessions.

In the name of the common people I want to ask what is the vast difference the Congress of these United States seems to find in a hungry American child and hungry Belgians, Germans, and Russians?

Why is it a charitable and a godly thing for them to vote millions to suffering foreigners and then stand back and say we can't afford to start anything of that kind in our own country?

Our people are suffering, our children are hungry and are cold because of insufficient food and clothing and still we (with our millions of bushels of wheat hoarded) are standing back and refusing to help them for fear we will make beggars and paupers of them. My God, Senator, a person who is destitute and unable to buy food is already a pauper (for the immediate time), and if they are not beggars they are more than likely to become something worse. When my children get hungry they are going to eat somehow and some way and you know me well enough to know I am not a red nor in sympathy with them in the least. But the most sure way to create bolshevism in this country that I can conceive is to let men's wives and children get hungry and cold and then say to them: "We gave unstintingly to all the

other nations of the world when they were in your condition without hope of being recompensed, without ever a desire of it being done. But you, our own citizens, we can't feed you and your children because it would make beggars and paupers of you; we will lend you a few dollars to feed your mules and buy seed for a crop if you will pledge us first chance at all you make next year; but your kids must go hungry and cold; we can't feed and clothe them even if we have got millions of bushels of wheat hoarded; we are too proud a nation to let it be said that our Government has to feed a part of us."

Mr. President, I might read more from this letter to the same tenor. That is the reaction of an ordinary American citizen, who himself does not need to be fed or clothed by the Government, but who, in his capacity as a citizen of a county in the State which I have the honor in part to represent, has observed the conditions of others, and he speaks only the language of the vast majority of the masses of our people, who can not understand the constitutional technicalities which make it entirely statesmanlike to appropriate money to purchase feed for stock and unstatesmanlike to appropriate money to purchase food for human beings.

Mr. President, I have a letter from the secretary of the drought-relief committee created in the State of Kentucky under the program of the President as outlined in the autumn of last year. I wish to call attention to a few facts disclosed in this report showing the enormous number of delinquent taxpayers in the counties of that State, not because we ask or expect that the Government of the United States shall pay their taxes but only as evidence of the conditions which exist, and which show the dire need of relief, at least so far as food and clothing are concerned.

In the county of Allen, State of Kentucky, 18½ per cent of the total taxes were unpaid on January 1. In Anderson County there were 468 delinquent taxpayers on January 1, compared to total payment on the same day of a year ago of taxes on the farms of that county.

In Ballard County 703 farmers were delinquent on January 1. In Bullitt County 913 farmers, representing 33½ per cent of the total, had not paid their taxes, and under the State law their land was subject to be sold at public auction at the courthouse door because of the nonpayment of their taxes.

In Carlisle County, down on the Mississippi River, 1,190 delinquent taxpayers were found in that one county alone, more than twice as many as existed one year ago. In Carroll County 239 farmers have been unable to pay their taxes. In Cumberland County 60 per cent of the farmers had been unable on January 1 of this year to pay their taxes. In Edmonson County 800 men owning farms had been unable to pay their taxes on January 1; in Elliott County, 653; Fleming County, 480; Grayson County, 60 per cent; Hancock County, 600; Hickman County, 80 per cent of the taxes paid and 20 per cent unpaid on January 1. In Jackson County 1,350 farmers had not paid their taxes on January 1. In Jessamine County collections were about normal. In Livingston County 491 taxpayers were delinquent; in McCracken County, 300; in McCreary County, 2,100 delinquents; in Meade County, a small county, 745 taxpayers were delinquent.

In Muhlenberg County 6,241 taxpayers on January 1 had been unable to pay their county, State, and local taxes. In Perry County on January 1 there were 1,500 delinquent taxpayers. In Powell County 45 per cent of the taxpayers had been unable to pay their taxes. In Robertson County there were 250 delinquent taxpayers. In Rockcastle County, in the edge of the mountains of east Kentucky, 3,225 owners of property had been unable to pay their taxes. In Union County there were 2,653 delinquent taxpayers and in Wolfe County 600 delinquent taxpayers.

These are taken at random from amongst the 120 counties in the State of Kentucky showing that on account of the drought situation, because of the failure of our crops, because the people have no money as the result of that disaster, their property is liable to be sold at public auction to satisfy the taxes of the State and counties—a condition which has been intensified because of the disastrous situation which has followed as the result of the drought.

Mr. President, I do not desire to take the time of the Senate unduly to depict these conditions. It is not a situation which any representative of that great State can take any pride in baring before the Senate of the United States; but, in all honesty, I do not believe the Government of the United States has known the conditions which have existed, not only in Kentucky but in other sections of our country. I do not believe that the Red Cross has been fully acquainted with the conditions which have existed in the State of Kentucky and elsewhere. Otherwise, I do not believe that Judge Payne, whom I have always regarded as a sincere, an honest, and a truthful man, would have made the statement before the Appropriations Committee only a few days ago that the \$5,000,000 which they had set aside for relief in the drought area was all that was needed. He has subsequently shown that it was not all that was needed because, if Judge Payne was correct two weeks ago or 10 days ago in stating to the Congress of the United States that \$5,000,000 was all they needed, then the only other conclusion is that the appeal now made for \$10,000,000 has been brought about because of the persistent activity on the part of the Senate of the United States to make up the deficiency by an appropriation out of the Public Treasury.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] seeks to draw a fine, hair-splitting and legalistic difference between appropriating money for the relief of hunger in the United States and the relief of hunger in other countries. He is driven to the position that the great difference which ought to actuate the American Congress is a selfish difference; that we are at perfect liberty to take the money out of our pockets and pockets of the people through the Treasury of the United States in order to feed Chinese and Russians, Belgians, Italians, and Germans, because they can not vote in an election here in the United States, and therefore it can not bring pressure to bear upon us, and that because some American citizens who can vote therefore we ought not to make an appropriation to keep them from starving to death. If the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] has his way, in all probability there will be fewer voters at the next election, because many of them may starve to death between now and the summer when the grass may grow, so that they may, according to his idea, be put on a level with the animals or with Nebuchadnezzar, who was commanded to go out and eat grass.

What is a dole, Mr. President? The other day I called attention to the fact that in 1914 in the town of Salem, Mass., they had a disastrous fire, and we appropriated \$200,000 for their relief. Was that a dole? We appropriated that money not as a loan, but as a gift. We did not ask anybody to give a mortgage to the United States on his humble cottage. We did not ask anybody there to give a lien on his wages during the ensuing year in order to pay back Shylock, who demanded his pound of flesh as the price of relief to human suffering. We took \$200,000 out of the Treasury of the United States and sent it to Salem to purchase food and clothing, medicine and shelter. Was that a dole?

We appropriated nearly \$3,000,000 when there was an enormous earthquake and fire in San Francisco, in the State of California, the home of the President. We appropriated nearly \$3,000,000 out of the Public Treasury, but not as a loan. We did not ask a Californian for security; we did not ask even a Chinaman living in the city of San Francisco to give a mortgage on his oriental shop during the ensuing year in order to repay the United States the \$2,750,000 which we appropriated for relief in San Francisco. The American Red Cross was likewise busily engaged in bringing relief to the city of San Francisco. The Red Cross appealed to the American people to go down into their pockets and give generously of their money in order that food and clothing, medicine, hospitals, and shelter might be provided for the people of that city. But I wonder whether the appropriation of \$3,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States was any handicap to the Red Cross then in undertaking to raise other millions of dollars for relief in the city of San Francisco?

When there was a great earthquake in Messina a few years ago the American Congress, out of its Treasury, out of the pockets of the people, appropriated hundreds of thousands and even millions of dollars for the relief of men, women, and children who had been deprived of their homes and of food and shelter. The Red Cross was likewise engaged in the raising of other millions of dollars for relief in the stricken area of Messina. We heard no complaint then that it would handicap the American Red Cross if Congress appropriated two or three million dollars to help take care of that great disaster.

During the annual recurring floods on the Mississippi River and other rivers of the country the American Red Cross has always been on the job. It has done that job with generosity and efficiency, but the Congress of the United States has made appropriations out of the Public Treasury to bring additional relief to the people of the Mississippi Valley. We heard no complaint then that our activities were interfering with the efforts of the Red Cross to raise money for relief in the flooded districts of the Mississippi Valley.

Was it a dole to give to the Mississippi Valley sufferers a little food and clothing and shelter? Was it a dole to give \$2,750,000 or \$3,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States for relief in San Francisco, which all of us were proud to see done because it made our hearts swell with pride that we did not stand back upon legal and constitutional technicalities when men, women, and children were starving and freezing to death? What makes it a dole?

We can appropriate \$200,000 for one small city, and it is an act of generosity. We can appropriate \$3,000,000 to an island belonging to some other government and that is generosity and statesmanship. Out of our Treasury and out of our hearts we can give \$3,000,000 to the city of San Francisco in the great State of California so ably represented here by the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and by his colleague [Mr. SHORTRIDGE]. But if we try to do a little something for a great area stricken by an act of God no less definite than the act of God which brought disaster to San Francisco, to New Orleans, to Salem, and to Messina, we are charged with undertaking to establish a dole system.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] may be satisfied with his distinction. The Senator from Connecticut may be afraid that if he votes to give some starving American enough food to go through the winter he may be intimidated and over-persuaded in the years to come to vote for another such appropriation. But I have no such fear so far as I am concerned; neither do I entertain any such fear with regard to other Senators here who know when there is a national crisis and a national disaster.

Are we to deny our own people the right to relief out of the Treasury which they themselves have filled, because it may influence them to vote either for or against us in the years to come? If it is claimed that our efforts here are interfering with the Red Cross I reply that our efforts here began six weeks before the efforts of the Red Cross to raise money. While I do not desire to say it, yet I am wondering whether the Red Cross ever would have asked for \$10,000,000 at the hands of the American people if we had not for six weeks been trying to get \$15,000,000 while men, women, and children have gone hungry?

In a leading editorial in the Washington Post of this morning the Democrats are charged with trying to filibuster in order to bring about an extra session of Congress; in other words, the charge is made that because we have hearts in our bosoms, because we are undertaking to do what seventy times previously the American Congress has done for suffering people, we are engaged in an effort to filibuster in order to bring about an extra session of the American Congress. I can speak only for myself, Mr. President. I have not been so active as has the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and as has been the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], but I have collaborated with them to the extent of my ability to bring about relief. I have not been willing to quibble over technicalities and indulge in constitutional hairsplitting in the face of this great disaster any more than I have been in the case of other

disasters as a result of which the American Congress has been asked to appropriate money to bring about relief. So far as I am concerned, I am against an extra session of Congress; I do not want an extra session of Congress; I am willing to meet here at 10 o'clock every day and to stay in session until 10 o'clock at night to avoid an extra session. I believe if the Congress of the United States would buckle down to its real duty and perform efficiently the business that lies upon the table of this session of Congress we could pass all needful legislation without the necessity for calling an extra session of the new Congress that comes into office on the 4th of March next. However, Mr. President, while I do not desire an extra session, while I shall regret it if one becomes necessary, nevertheless I do not propose to avoid one or to contribute to its avoidance if when we reach the end of the present session it shall be found necessary, in the interest of the American people, to bring Congress back to perform its duties and to enact necessary legislation.

I do not know what will be the final fate of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, but I trust that it will be agreed to here without dissent and that when it reaches another body, the coordinate branch of the legislative department of this Government, the good God may find some way to melt the stony hearts of those who stand in the way of relief for honest, hard-working, patriotic American citizens who are not in the habit of asking charity but who only ask justice to them and to their families.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there are just two matters to which I desire to call the attention of the Senate at this time. We all recognize in the Red Cross a great and splendid charitable organization. It has done a wonderful work in the past. I know the present head of that organization, Judge John Barton Payne, and I have known him for nearly 20 years. He is an exceedingly fine man. I am devoted to him personally. I am, however, truly astonished that he should have so far forgotten the history of that great organization over which he presides as to take the stand he is now taking in reference to this drought relief amendment.

Mr. President, as we all know, there is situated in the city of Washington what is known as the Red Cross Building, a white marble building, one of the most beautiful buildings in our wonderful Capital. When that building was erected the Red Cross did not take the same position about public and private contributions that Judge Payne and that association are now taking. They called upon the Government to furnish a portion of the money with which to erect that building. I want to read the act of Congress by which a site for the building was bought and the building erected. On October 22, 1913, there was approved by the President a bill providing for the erection of that building, and I read one excerpt from the act:

To make payment of a part contribution to the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a memorial in the District of Columbia to commemorate the service and the sacrifices of the women of the United States, North and South, for the sick and wounded in war, \$400,000: *Provided*, That said memorial shall be a building monumental in design and character and shall be used as the permanent headquarters of the American Red Cross and shall cost, with the site, not less than \$700,000.

In other words, Mr. President, the Red Cross then asked for private contributions, just as it does now, for a part of the money, and at the same time it asked the Government to appropriate a sum to enable it to erect the building. Under that act the title to that property is still in the Government of the United States. Why can not the Red Cross carry out the same plan of raising money now?

Not only that, but, as I shall show in a moment or two, heretofore in crises exactly like this, the Red Cross has co-operated with the Government in precisely the same way that it is now proposed it shall.

I was very much interested in the address of the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] a few moments ago in which he criticized and opposed this appropriation. His attitude was truly astounding to me. I had a general

recollection of what several years ago he had proposed for the relief of the suffering people of Porto Rico; but I had forgotten the details. I have since ascertained what they were. I want to read an excerpt or two from a joint resolution then introduced by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. On December 5, 1928, just a little more than two years ago, when a great hurricane and, I believe, attending calamities overtook the people of Porto Rico, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] introduced a joint resolution which in part is as follows:

Whereas the island of Porto Rico was suffering from the effects of a violent hurricane of extraordinary intensity, unusual duration, and unexampled violence which visited the island on September 13 and 14, 1928; and

Whereas no part of the island escaped suffering some damage; and

Whereas the total number of people affected by the hurricane was 1,454,047, of whom, according to the report of the American Red Cross, more than one-third, or 510,161, were absolutely destitute and without food—

"And without food."

Then the joint resolution embodies a number of other whereases which I shall not read; but I ask at this time that the entire resolution, being Senate Joint Resolution 172, may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 172) for the relief of Porto Rico, as reported with amendments on December 11, 1928, is as follows:

Whereas the island of Porto Rico is suffering from the effects of a violent hurricane of extraordinary intensity, unusual duration, and unexampled violence which visited the island on September 13 and 14, 1928; and

Whereas no part of the island escaped suffering some damage; and

Whereas the total number of people affected by the hurricane was 1,454,047, of whom, according to the report of the American Red Cross, more than one-third, or 510,161, were absolutely destitute and without food; and

Whereas the coffee and fruit crops were almost totally destroyed, and the coffee plantations so injured that it will be at least five years before they can be restored to normal conditions; and

Whereas a very large part of the shade trees which are essential for the successful functioning of a coffee plantation were destroyed and more than five years will be required for their replacement or recovery; and

Whereas more than 140,000, or about one-third, of the trees in the coconut plantations were destroyed, and it will be at least seven years before the new trees to be planted in their place will be bearing fruit; and

Whereas the damage to all the insular industries has been so great as to make it impossible for the insular government to give adequate relief in the emergency: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a commission, to be known as the Porto Rican Hurricane Relief Commission (hereinafter referred to as the commission), and to consist of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of Agriculture, of whom the Secretary of War shall be the chairman. It shall be the duty of the commission to assist in the rehabilitation of agriculture in the island of Porto Rico, particularly on the coffee plantations and on the coconut plantations, to encourage a more general planting of food crops needed by laborers on the plantations, especially of root crops, to aid in the repair and restoration of schools and roads, and to assist in providing employment for unemployed and destitute laborers. The commissioners shall receive no compensation for their services under this resolution.

SEC. 2. (a) The commission is authorized (1) without regard to the civil service laws to appoint and, without regard to the classification act of 1923, as amended, to fix the compensation of a secretary and such clerical and other assistants, and (2) to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere) as may be necessary in carrying out the provisions of this resolution. The commission may, to the extent deemed advisable by it, utilize the facilities and the clerical and other personnel of the Department of the Treasury, the Department of War, and the Department of Agriculture, and may request and accept the cooperation of the insular and municipal governments of Porto Rico in carrying out the provisions of this resolution.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$50,000 for administrative expenses incurred in carrying out the provisions of this resolution.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution the commission shall have power to make loans to any individual coffee planter, coconut planter, fruit grower, or other agriculturist in the island of Porto Rico in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the commission shall by regulation prescribe, including an agreement by the borrowers to use

the loan for the purposes specified by the commission; except that no such loan shall be made for a period of more than 10 years or in an amount in excess of \$25,000 to any one individual. The rate of interest upon each such loan beginning with the fourth year shall be 5 per cent per annum, but the commission may, in its discretion, defer the payment of interest upon any such loan for such a period of time as the commission shall deem necessary. All such loans shall be made by the commission itself or through such agencies as the commission shall designate. For carrying out the purposes of this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000, of which \$5,000,000 shall be made immediately available, \$3,000,000 shall be made available on January 1, 1930, and \$2,000,000 shall be made available on January 1, 1931. All money received during a period of five years from the date of the approval of this joint resolution as repayment of any loan or interest on loan made under the provisions of this joint resolution shall be held by said commission as a revolving fund which may be loaned on applications for the purposes and upon the terms and conditions herein provided, and all money received thereafter as payments of interest and principal on all loans made under the provisions of this joint resolution shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$2,000,000 to be used for the rebuilding and repair of school-houses damaged or destroyed by the hurricane in the small towns and rural districts of Porto Rico and for the employment of labor and the purchase of materials for repairing insular and rural municipal roads. The sum hereby authorized to be appropriated shall be expended in such manner and in such amounts as the commission shall approve.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$100,000 to be expended by the commission in the purchase and distribution within the devastated area of Porto Rico of seeds and seedlings, particularly of food and root crops, in such manner as it deems advisable.

SEC. 6. The commission shall make an annual report to Congress at the beginning of each regular session, giving a complete account of its activities in carrying out the provisions of this resolution.

Mr. McKELLAR. The joint resolution provided for the creation of a commission and authorized an appropriation of \$10,000,000 to relieve that situation in Porto Rico. A House joint resolution was finally adopted, and I want to read just a part of it. Under it the commission had a perfect right to buy food, and I have no doubt they did so. Section 2 of the joint resolution that was finally passed gave the commission authority—

To make such expenditures . . . as may be necessary in carrying out the provisions of this resolution.

And again—

For carrying out the purposes of this section (section 3) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$6,000,000—

This was the joint resolution that was finally passed—

of which \$3,000,000 shall be immediately available, \$2,000,000 shall be made available on January 1, 1930, and \$1,000,000 shall be made available on January 1, 1931. All money received during a period of five years from the date of the approval of this joint resolution as repayment of any loan or interest on loan made under the provisions of this joint resolution shall be held by said commission as a revolving fund, which may be loaned on applications for the purposes and under the terms and conditions herein provided, and all money received thereafter as payments of interest and principal on all loans made under the provisions of this joint resolution shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Now, Mr. President, let us see how they operated. Judge Payne, as I now understand him, says that if the Government shall make a contribution, such action will prevent private contributions. Let us see what was done in this particular case. I now read from the report of the Hurricane Relief Commission which was established. On page 2 of that report it is said:

The President of the United States, in his dual capacity as Chief Executive and president of the American National Red Cross, issued a proclamation urging the people to contribute liberally through the Red Cross—

Just as he has done in this case—

an appeal that was most generously met by contributions totaling \$3,100,000. The work of the Red Cross was prompt, far-reaching, and effective.

So it appears in that case that the Government and the Red Cross cooperated, the Government appropriating over \$7,000,000 and the Red Cross providing \$3,100,000; they operated jointly for the relief of the people of Porto Rico, just as is proposed in this instance they shall cooperate for

the relief of suffering in the United States. Then the report goes on to say:

Food, shelter, clothing, and medical aid were provided, and, as soon as the emergency situation was somewhat under control, measures to aid in the general rehabilitation were undertaken, such as the distribution of lumber and building material for repair of houses, the clearing of the coffee plantations, the distribution of seeds to small farmers, the supplying of coffee seedlings, the provision of funds to establish coffee seed beds, etc.

Mr. President, here is an identical and parallel case. Private subscriptions were turned in to the Red Cross for this purpose to the extent of \$3,100,000, and the Congress itself made a contribution of more than \$7,000,000, and made it a revolving fund so that it could be continuously used for the purposes set out in the joint resolution, which was introduced by the Senator from Connecticut, who is now opposed to this measure of relief of our own people. I do not mean to say that the Porto Rican people are not our own people; they are; but when I say "our own people" I refer, of course, to people in continental United States. The Senator from Connecticut opposes the pending amendment because it proposes to relieve the sufferings of the people in the United States, but he was the ardent supporter of the joint resolution providing relief for the people of Porto Rico. The very report to which I have referred shows that the Senator was so greatly interested in the conditions of starvation and destitution and want among the Porto Ricans, brought about by the hurricane in that island, that he made a personal visit to the island and remained there for 10 days apparently supervising the work to some extent. But the Senator from Connecticut takes a position this morning in opposition to the pending amendment. He seems to favor such contributions to the people of foreign countries, but does not favor contributions to people of our own country, because it will set a bad precedent.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. According to the Senator from Connecticut, it is a bad precedent because American citizens are able to vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. I had intended to refer to that.

Mr. CARAWAY. In other words, he impugns the honesty and integrity of American citizens.

Mr. McKELLAR. Apparently so. I think the Senator from Connecticut, when he considers what he has stated about it, will want to take that part of his speech of this morning back.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Just one moment. Surely neither the Senator from Connecticut nor any other Senator here will say that as between starving people he favors helping the starving people of other countries, but is unwilling to help the starving people of this country.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would not the same argument apply to obtaining high tariffs on textiles? Would not the same temptation exist for those who got favors out of the Public Treasury by increasing the tariff on textiles to vote to demand still more, and to vote for those who granted them?

Mr. McKELLAR. Why, of course, in a more marked degree.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, that has been one of the purposes from the beginning of the high protective tariff system.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course it was.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Connecticut has never protested that he was liable to be overpowered, and compelled to vote for another high tariff, because he helped somebody get one this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. In answer to what the Senator has just said, to my mind the statement made by the Senator from Connecticut is simply monstrous; and I am quite sure that if he ever thinks about it at all he will want to withdraw that statement. Surely he would not prefer helping the starving of foreign countries over the starving of his own country.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator does not expect him to do that, does he?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know; but I think he should do that, and I hope he will do it. I think the Senator from Connecticut must have spoken inadvertently.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. I hold in my hand the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1930. I find that since 1920 the Government of the United States has given to the railroads, as a guaranty of profits, the sum of \$531,756,045, a little more than half a billion dollars. Has the Senator heard any of these Senators objecting to relieving distressed railroads on the ground that that was a dole?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I think practically all of the Senators who are now opposed to this amendment actually voted for these largesses to the railroad companies.

Mr. BLACK. May I also call the Senator's attention to the fact that on the preceding page there appears a total of the obligations assumed by the Government for the railroads, not including the \$500,000,000, of \$985,094,063—practically a billion dollars?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. May I suggest to the Senator that the dole seems to consist in relieving the distress of those who are in poverty and poor; but if the amount is large enough to relieve those who have great power, it is not a dole—it is an act of statesmanship?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. McKELLAR. Just a moment, until I answer that suggestion, and then I will yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

I call the Senator's attention to the remarks made by the Senator from Connecticut this morning, in which, when I interrupted him and asked him if he had not introduced a bill exactly similar to the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, he said "no"; and one of the distinctions he undertook to make was that the moneys he provided down there were loans to the great property owners, the men of influence in Porto Rico. When I come to look at his resolution, however, I find that it provides, just as this amendment does, for the relief of human hunger, because it provides for food; and the report shows that a part of the appropriation was used for food.

I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut is not here, and in his absence I am coming to his defense.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not think that anything I have said is a personal criticism of the Senator from Connecticut. I simply deplore his changed attitude.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; I am not charging that; but the Senator must be fair. He must realize that the Porto Ricans can not vote here. The Senator from Connecticut is not opposed to spending public money to prevent the starvation of foreigners but only to its expenditure here, for our own people.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; he said that.

Mr. NORRIS. The reason is that our people vote, and the Porto Ricans do not.

I desire, further, to call the attention of the Senator to the unfair comparison made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK]. He refers to something over \$500,000,000 that we paid out of the Public Treasury to pay the railroads some claim that they had, where we guaranteed their income for six months after the roads were turned back to them. That is hardly a fair comparison, because the Senator must admit that the railroads do not vote; so that case is still within the rule laid down by the Senator from Connecticut. He is only opposed to furnishing food to starving people who know how to vote and can vote. The Senator ought to bear that in mind all the time in all the comparisons that he makes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. McKELLAR. In just one moment.

The suggestion made by the Senator from Nebraska is very timely; but, at the same time, the Senator from Connecticut drew his distinction very clearly. I asked the Senator from Connecticut a question about the Russian appropriation, and the European appropriation, and maybe one or two others. He said yes, he approved those things; that they were acts of generosity upon the part of this Government toward the starving people of those countries. He distinguished them very clearly, however, by saying that while he favored having the Government contribute to the feeding of people of foreign countries, he thought it was a bad precedent to establish in this country, for the reason that it would cause people here in the Senate to vote differently than the way they might otherwise honestly desire to vote.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a minute?

Mr. McKELLAR. In just a moment. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky, who desired first to interrupt me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut or any other Senators are afraid that by appropriating a little money out of the Treasury we are going to corrupt the American people, would it not be a good idea to send all of our road money over to Europe and build their roads, because it might corrupt us to spend it here? Would it not also be a good idea to have the post office appropriation bill provide money to carry mails in Europe, or some other countries, because it might corrupt some American to have his mail brought to him every morning?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. And all the other activities of the Government might likewise corrupt people.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator's statement of the logical conclusion to be deduced from what the Senator from Connecticut said is as he states; but I have taken the position that the Senator from Connecticut owes it to himself, and owes it to the other Members of this body, to retract that statement and take it back.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CARAWAY. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the Senator from Connecticut is not present. Just after making his speech against other people being supplied with food he immediately went to lunch.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sorry he is not here. I am quite sure, however, he knew that I expected to make some statement about what he had said.

Mr. President, I have been diverted for a moment from the purpose for which I rose. It is to show that the Senator from Connecticut himself has set the precedent for this very action. The Porto Ricans were our own people. They may vote some time. Who knows? They may come in as a State some time, and what we did may corrupt some representative of those people. We can not say as to that; but they are our own people. They belong to us, and they are on a different plane from those in foreign countries about whom the Senator undertook to make a distinction. Here, however, he can not make the distinction, and no one can make the distinction, for the reason that they are our own people. They were suffering for food; they were suffering for shelter; they were suffering all along the line; and the American Government contributed something like \$7,000,000, and made it a revolving fund, to help them. At the same time the Red Cross busied itself, and raised \$3,100,000 for exactly the same purpose. They worked together to supply the poor people down there with the necessities of life and keep them from starving to death.

I think that was an admirable plan. I think it ought to have been done. I voted for the measure. I think I ought to have voted for it. I do not know of any Senator who did not vote for that measure. It was a measure that it seemed to me it was our duty to pass. We did pass it. There has been no criticism of it; and I see no reason why exactly the same precedent can not be followed here. We should not make a distinction between the starving people of our dependencies and the people of continental United States, especially in view of the Red Cross's own history, its

own building having been built in part by contributions from the Government. Four hundred thousands dollars came from the Government and \$300,000 was raised by private subscription. They cooperated in the construction of the building. The Red Cross has cooperated with the Government all along. The Red Cross is almost a Government institution. It is aided by the Government; its building was partially built by the Government. Why can it not go on with its private contributions right now, supplemented by this appropriation from the Government, to the end that these people who are suffering may be relieved?

I hope the Senate will take that view.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, it seems to me there can be but little difficulty in finding a difference between this proposed appropriation and those which have been referred to by the Senators in the speeches this morning. Persons who want to find a difference can find it easily. If they do not want to find it, of course, they will not find it. So far as I have been able to ascertain, however, this is the first time that an effort has been made by the Federal Government to appropriate money solely because there is a depression in the land, and people in various parts of the country are in distress.

Of course, stress has been laid upon the conditions in the territory that suffered from the drought; but this appropriation is intended to cover the whole territory of the United States, wherever it may be found that people are in need.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. If this appropriation were confined to drought relief, we would have plenty of precedents for it; would we not?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes; probably that is true. The difficulty which I have just mentioned, however, is not, in my judgment, the real difficulty before the Senate to-day. The Senate to-day is in a race with the Red Cross in its effort to appropriate money out of the Federal Treasury without giving the Red Cross an opportunity to see whether it can get the money from the generous people of America; and to my mind that indeed is a sorry spectacle. In my judgment, it reflects no credit upon those who propose it, and that the sound second thought of American public opinion will ultimately condemn it.

The argument has been made here that the opposition to the amendment is based on the fact that those opposed to it are afraid that it will increase the taxes of the wealthy people of the Nation. I submit, however, that that sort of an argument can not prevail with thinking people. It is made for the sole purpose of deceiving the American people, and in my judgment in some instances for political purposes also.

I am satisfied that there are wealthy men in the Senate who will hesitate to vote against this amendment because they are afraid it will be charged that they voted against it because they did not want their taxes increased. There are other men in the Senate who will not vote against the amendment because they are afraid they will be charged with trying to protect the wealthy people of the Nation. Under circumstances of this sort I am inclined solemnly to thank the good Lord that I am poor enough to do as I please; and I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. President, I do not like to vote against an appropriation to an organization for which I have such unbounded admiration and confidence as I have for the Red Cross without in a very few words saying why.

My first objection is that I think this proposition is most untimely. It is only a few days since the Red Cross offered its appeal for \$10,000,000. They have several millions already available for this relief, and if they had that \$10,000,000 there would be a large sum with which certainly for a good while they would be able to relieve the current distress. But, of course, their appeal for \$10,000,000 is killed by this proposition of the Senate. I notice that

close by—in Baltimore—yesterday a meeting was called to raise Baltimore's quota of the \$10,000,000, but it was called off because, it was said, if the Congress is going to appropriate, why should the individuals appropriate? Congress enters upon the project and takes it away from the volunteer contributions of the people. I think that is unfortunate.

I think it is bad for the Red Cross otherwise. The Red Cross is probably the greatest philanthropic organization of the country, and it not only does good by relieving suffering, but it does good by persuading and prevailing upon millions of people to become members, to contribute their mite every year for the support of this great cause, and therefore makes them agents of philanthropy and interested unselfishly in relieving distress. That is one of the greatest accomplishments, I think, of the Red Cross, that over 4,000,000 people are contributing to it every year, many of them with very slight means, and therefore themselves becoming self-sacrificing agents of good will and having excited in their minds a zeal for the good of other people.

It seems to me that spirit is going to be killed, or at least crippled, because if it is established that the United States is to contribute from its Treasury millions to the Red Cross, why should the people all over the country care to contribute their little mite, which will amount to nothing compared with the contributions of the Government?

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLET. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. I wonder whether the Senator has had any experience in observing how many of the very rich do not contribute to the Red Cross?

Mr. GILLET. I do not know.

Mr. COUZENS. I think the Senator might make inquiry, because I know of personal knowledge that there are many, many rich people who hoard their money and do not contribute either to the Red Cross or to any community chest. Obviously this is a way of reaching those people when Congress appropriates the money.

Mr. GILLET. Of course, there are some such people; but I was speaking of the poor people who at some sacrifice become philanthropists.

Mr. COUZENS. There is no reason why they can not continue to do that, as I see it.

Mr. GILLET. No; but the great motive for it is taken away if the Government appropriates. There are stingy people in the country, undoubtedly, stingy people among the rich and the poor alike, and people who do not contribute, but, after all, I think the contributions to our great charities show that the American people, rich and poor alike, are as a rule a generous people, and while I do not know, and nobody knows, I suppose, just who does contribute, yet I think we have a right to be rather complacent and proud that our people as a class are generous, and contribute to philanthropic enterprises.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GILLET. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not necessary to impugn the generosity of anybody in order really to consider the present situation as it exists. There are local chapters of the American Red Cross all over the country, and those local chapters have made strenuous efforts to raise money enough to take care of their local conditions, and thousands of localities have raised all the money they can raise, and have exhausted their resources. It is impossible for the Red Cross to expect any further contributions from those sources. So, granting the most generous impulses to the people to contribute this \$10,000,000, in the very nature of things, it is more difficult to raise the money now than it would be under normal conditions, and that may make it necessary for the Federal Government to come forward.

Mr. GILLET. But we have not given them a chance. I agree it is more difficult, but it is less than a week since the appeal was made.

Mr. BARKLEY. Every Red Cross chapter I have heard anything from has been making a drive to get money. There

may be some more or less important and wealthy people whose activities overlap local communities and States who might give this \$10,000,000, but I do not know who they are.

Mr. GILLETT. Of course, they are contributing all the time; but the particular drive for this \$10,000,000 is just being started. They have often made such drives, and have almost always been successful, and I believe they would be successful this time if they had a chance. But I do not believe they will be if this legislation goes through; and whether it goes through or not, the very suggestion of it has a tendency to prevent success, as I have said, as illustrated by the case of Baltimore, where already the effort to raise the quota has been stopped. Of course some hundreds of thousands of dollars have been raised already, I understand, but nobody can tell whether we would have raised the \$10,000,000 or not. I believe we would.

Aside from that, however, there is to my mind another real, fundamental objection to this legislation, and that is the fact the Senator from Delaware so well stated, that it is a proposal to start in on a precedent of helping the whole country because of a depression. I recognize the complete distinction between the drought-stricken areas and the rest of the country which is suffering from unemployment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETT. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. What the Senator says is true, and perhaps the amendment should be amended. Nevertheless, the Senator will realize that this money will be placed in the hands of the Red Cross, I suppose on the theory that they are equipped and have the machinery; and can we not trust them—even if we do not amend the legislation? I do not know that I have any objection to an amendment which would meet the Senator's objection, which I think has some merit. Nevertheless, will not the Senator admit that this great organization, in which I think we all have almost unlimited confidence, will be able to use this money where there is distress, and will not use it where there is not distress?

Mr. GILLETT. They will not use it where there is not distress, of course; but that is just the distinction which I make between the drought-stricken regions and the others. In the drought-stricken regions there is distress in great measure which the locality can not remedy—

Mr. NORRIS. Let us assume that there is, for the sake of the argument. If somebody is suffering for food and can not be cared for by local charity, by his neighbors, I would not object to using the money to buy food for him. We can not inquire into the cause of the distress, or the location of it.

Mr. GILLETT. The Senator did not allow me to complete my distinction. My distinction is this, that in the drought-stricken areas the localities are incapable of remedying the distress. They have to be helped from outside, and the question in my mind is, Shall they be helped by the National Government from outside, or should we trust, as I think we should, the Red Cross to be able to raise the \$10,000,000 which, with the millions they have already, would certainly relieve the distress for a long while? The danger of this legislation is illustrated by the remarks this morning of the Senator from New York, who said that there is a great national depression and distress, and that this fund ought to be used to relieve the national depression and distress everywhere; and he alluded to his own city of New York.

I appreciate that there is suffering and distress in almost every great city and small city, but the distinction I make is that they are capable of taking care of their own, and that they ought to take care of their own, whereas these drought-stricken regions can not take care of their own, and must have assistance from outside.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator stated the condition with perfect fairness. There are localities where the people could take care of their own distress. But does not the Senator believe the Red Cross will use this money only in cases where local authorities will not take care of the distress? Somebody has to decide that.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. President, that, it seems to me, is going to put a terrible strain on the Red Cross or on anybody having the responsibility. If we restrict it to the drought-stricken region, then we relieve that, and escape a most difficult situation and in like measure limit a vicious precedent and principle.

Mr. NORRIS. Can the Senator propose an amendment which would carry out his idea? Would we not at once get into difficulty if we provided the money should be spent only in drought-stricken regions, and then were technical about it? A man who was in a region which covered only a square mile might come within the definition. I think it would be almost impossible to draw a definition that would be satisfactory. It seems to me we have to leave it to somebody. This amendment proposes to leave it with the Red Cross. If there is a better organization, or any better way, I would be glad to have it put into the law myself.

Mr. GILLETT. The principle which I think is vicious in this matter is that it destroys, or at least relaxes and tends to destroy, the principle of self-support and self-dependence and responsibility and pride and local provision by each community for its own people, which is the foundation of our American Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was wondering whether the situation described, no doubt accurately, by the Senator from Massachusetts does not emphasize the inability of local communities to contribute to the drought-stricken areas. Take, for instance, the great city of Chicago, where there are 250,000 men out of work, which represents about a million people. Take the great city of Detroit, where the Senator from Michigan lives, where recently it was announced that there were some 50,000 to 80,000 men out of work because of the slump in the automobile industry, which represents a large number of people, and no doubt represents great hunger and want. They have undertaken to care for that situation locally, and I am wondering whether the necessity to do that has not made it impossible for very many of them to be expected to come to our rescue in the drought-stricken areas.

Mr. GILLETT. As I have said, the Red Cross is not given a chance to see whether they can raise the \$10,000,000. I rather think they would raise it.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETT. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not want to embarrass the Senator, because for him I have a very high regard; but applying his rule, when Salem, Mass., was destroyed by fire, and Representative Gardner, a man of high reputation and really fine character, a son-in-law of Senator Lodge, introduced a resolution to give \$200,000 to Salem, the Senator then was a Member of the House, and was present, and he did not feel compelled at that time to announce his doctrine that a community that is able to care for itself ought to do so, because undoubtedly the State of Massachusetts could have raised \$200,000.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. President, that is one instance that illustrates the great pressure brought upon one from his own section. I will state my position in regard to that matter.

Mr. CARAWAY. Pardon me; the Senator admits, then, that he yielded to local pressure, but he will not yield to the present appeal for assistance.

Mr. GILLETT. I did not yield; I did not support the appeal.

Mr. CARAWAY. Did not the Senator vote for it?

Mr. GILLETT. No.

Mr. CARAWAY. Did he vote?

Mr. GILLETT. The Senator from Kentucky called my attention to that matter the other day. I will tell just what happened.

Mr. CARAWAY. I know what happened.

Mr. GILLETT. I was opposed to it and talked against it until my most intimate friend in the delegation, to whom the Senator referred, Mr. Gardner, pressed me, saying it was outrageous for a man from the State to oppose it, and

begged me if I could not vote for it, at least keep away, and I rather thought I did keep away, until I looked up the record the other day and found that I stayed there and voted "present." That was not voting for it. I think that shows pretty well how I felt.

Mr. CARAWAY. Where did the Senator make his speech, in the cloakroom?

Mr. GILLETT. I spoke in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CARAWAY. Not for the RECORD?

Mr. GILLETT. No; I did not oppose it on the floor.

Mr. CARAWAY. Is it not remarkable that a man with the high character and the great courage and the devotion to public duty which the Senator has always manifested remained absolutely silent, instead of raising his voice then, when his own people wanted help, but now so courageously comes to the front to deny other people the right to eat?

Mr. GILLETT. The Senator must draw his own inferences. I do not think they will be very detrimental to me, either.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator has done me the honor to mention what I said about conditions in New York. This is the way I reconcile myself to vote for the pending appropriation, if I may say so to the Senator. I regard the present situation as a great national disaster. We have economic depression and unemployment everywhere. As a result of the general situation we are called upon locally—for instance, in my city of New York—to contribute very generously for the care of the unemployed. We have a committee there known as the Prosser Committee, which has raised \$8,000,000—

Mr. GILLETT. I hope the Senator will not take a great deal of my time.

Mr. COPELAND. I beg the Senator's pardon, but I wanted to show that we are dealing with a very different problem here because now we have a national situation, and therefore there can not be the response to Red Cross appeals because of local necessity and therefore the Red Cross can not be effective.

Mr. GILLETT. That is where we differ. I believe there would have been a response to the appeal of the Red Cross and we would have gotten \$10,000,000; but, of course, that is speculation and there is no use to discuss it. What the Senator said shows the great difficulty that is going to come in any such exigency as this for the Red Cross or for the Government. We all admit that the distress in the regions where they can not be helped and taken care of at home must be relieved by help from outside, and if there is no other agency to do it I would be in favor of the United States Government doing it. But I do not believe we have reached that stage yet, and I do not believe we ought to embark on this dangerous policy until we have reached it, because, just as the Senator from New York said, there would be pressure from New York, for instance, for some of this fund just as there will be pressure of a similar kind from other cities. There was a good illustration of it right from my own city of Springfield, which is as substantial and public spirited and well-to-do city of 150,000 as there is in the country. Yet in that city, where they are taking care of their own and always will and ought to no matter how great the strain, when the man who had charge of the poor relief received a letter from the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] asking him to give information about the unemployed and the need for food and whether he would like to have Government assistance, he wrote back and said that they would welcome Federal assistance. That was but natural. That would be the instinctive thing to say. The ordinary man does not stop to think of the danger lurking in such a policy. But think of what it would mean toward the setting up of a vicious and harmful practice. If we once start feeding the hungry all over the country, the appetite will grow by virtue of what they feed on, the Federal

Government would be leaned on for help in every emergency, and where we would finally end under such circumstances it is difficult for anyone to prophesy.

I think nearly every Senator will recognize and admit that as a policy it is unfortunate and undesirable to make the Government appropriate money either to the Red Cross to supply food or directly to supply food to any portion of the country.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. COUZENS. Does the Senator think the management of the Red Cross is so weak and incompetent that it could not resist demands for the use of its money where it is not needed or where the demands may be supplied by local authorities or local people?

Mr. GILLETT. I think the management of the Red Cross is the best possible management into whose hands we could put this fund. I think they probably have better agencies for finding the needs and distributing the funds. I have unbounded faith and confidence in that organization. I do not want to damage and weaken it, as I think this would. But the trouble is that there are real needs to-day almost everywhere. There are pressing needs, as the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] said, even in the richest city in the world, and there will be pressure from there. I do not think a great rich city like New York City ought to be helped from the Federal Treasury to feed its hungry, and yet when it was specifically said that this fund is to go everywhere, and not alone to the drought-stricken regions, it, of course, is an intimation to every city and town throughout the country when they know that they are strained, as they all are in these times, that they may try to get their part out of the Federal Treasury, especially when they feel that they contributed largely to fill that Treasury. Thus it stimulates all over the country the idea that the Federal Treasury is a great reservoir which fills itself and from which they all can draw.

I say it is very dangerous to put the responsibility on the Red Cross to discriminate and decide where they shall apply the fund. I think we are starting upon an unfortunate system which we ought to avoid, and while I have limitless confidence in the Red Cross and think that is the best way it could be done, yet I do not think it ought to be done at all.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETT. I yield the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Alabama will let me have about five minutes before he begins?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am going to speak for only a few minutes.

Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] has admitted to-day that he has violated one of the fundamental principles of the Bible, which teaches that charity shall begin at home. The Senator informs us that, as a Member of the House, he failed and refused to vote for an appropriation, which I supported, to relieve the suffering people of Salem, Mass., when fire swept that city, destroying the people's clothing, food, and houses.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator from Massachusetts was Speaker of the House at that time, I believe, and I understood him a while ago to say that he was present, but would not vote for the appropriation to relieve the people of his own State when they were in great distress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. GILLETT. I simply want to say that I do not consider it charity to vote away other people's money. I think charity means to give something of one's own.

Mr. HEFLIN. Charity means love in action. It blesses him who sends it forth and blesses him who receives. When those people were in distress in the Senator's own State and

they could not obtain relief within the State, the Senator would not vote for Federal relief for them. The situation there was acute and very urgent and the Senator from Massachusetts, rather than set a bad example and probably teach some of those people that they might rely upon the Federal Government for support in the future as they stood there hungry and cold and destitute, withheld from them Federal aid. He was fearful that he might probably set a bad example to those people by supplying them in their deep distress with the things they had to have in order to live. Mr. President, God forbid that I shall ever preach such a philosophy as that when men, women, and children by the hundreds of thousands threatened with starvation are lifting up their hands hopefully to their Government, to whose rescue they always come with their brave sons in time of national danger. God forbid that that philosophy shall ever obtain to any considerable extent in this great lawmaking body of our Nation.

The Senator from Massachusetts, the big-hearted and exceedingly tender-hearted, merciful Senator, has served in this body about six years. It has been announced recently that \$16,000,000 of income taxes has been refunded to the Whitney estate. I have not heard the Senator lift his voice in protest against that refund. I announce to him now and to those who oppose the pending appropriation for people in distress—patriotic, loyal American citizens—that the Government is refunding annually to the mighty rich \$100,000,000 of taxes that are worked over in the Treasury Department by clerks and others, and refunded, they say, because of mistakes discovered.

O Mr. President, I would like to know when this scandalous business will stop. One hundred million dollars of mistakes made in one year? It is not true. Nobody believes that \$16,000,000 of mistakes were made in the Whitney estate. I do not believe it. A mistake of \$100,000 or \$200,000 may have been made in a payment of many millions of dollars, and I am not so sure about that, because these big estates, when they are paying their taxes, employ the finest tax experts and the best lawyers on the face of the earth to see that they do not pay a dollar more than they are compelled to pay. Later on, after the payment is made and everything is quiet along the Potomac, lo and behold, so-called big "mistakes" are discovered, as in this instance, and refunds are made and \$16,000,000 in this instance carried out to one estate in Massachusetts, and the big, brave-hearted and noble Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] never "batted an eye" when that took place before his eyes right here in the Capital of the Nation.

But when we talk about appropriating \$25,000,000 for the immediate relief of distressed millions of patriotic people in 21 States of the Union, then the Senator from Massachusetts rises up and makes known his vigorous opposition to such a measure. But that is not all. Mr. President, when his friend, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] offered a resolution which passed this body to loan money to the people in distress in Porto Rico because of the ravages of a cyclone, and provided that the money should be loaned to them for a period of 10 years, and as much as \$25,000 to those in distress that needed it, the Senator from Massachusetts was as silent as the tomb. He never lifted his voice in protest against that measure.

We are asking here for an appropriation to meet the immediate needs of people who are in a desperate situation because of conditions over which they had no control. We are told of a bread riot in St. Louis on yesterday. Still the Senator from Massachusetts would withhold food from the hungry because he is afraid that by feeding them he might set a bad example for future generations.

I would not have the Government set a precedent for appropriating money to lazy people, people who can obtain work but who will not work. I would not favor doing such a thing. The people for whom we are pleading to-day are industrious, patriotic Americans. They work and they produce that which feeds and clothes the world. But a terrible drought has come upon them, withering, parching, and destroying their crops in the field. Nothing of consequence

has been produced. Farm cattle in many places have perished, and hungry men, women, and children are despondent and almost desperate in many places. They are gathering in groups to-day in 21 States pleading for help—immediate help—and they are wondering what the trouble is with their own great Government at the Capital that relief is not forthcoming to them.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] tells us that we should take no action in this matter, but should go out and appeal to the mighty rich for funds with which to relieve patriotic citizens in distress. O Mr. President, when the Ship Trust wanted money with which to build ships to be used for the benefit of their business upon the high seas the Senator from Massachusetts did not suggest that they go out and ask for contributions from men of wealth. When they were seeking money for a private enterprise purely for themselves, out of which they expected to make a profit, the Senator from Massachusetts did not suggest that they go to private individuals to get it; but he wanted the Government to loan it, and the Government has loaned it in the neighborhood of \$150,000,000.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. Did not a man by the name of Lazarus once try that experiment?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; he did. Lazarus was almost dead; he was very feeble, mainly because he had not sufficient food to keep him healthy and strong. He begged old Dives to help him, but Dives would not give him anything except the crumbs that fell from his table. And now the Senator from Massachusetts wants American citizens, patriotic men, women, who are in distress and in need of immediate relief to get only such contributions as some kindly disposed rich person may feel disposed to give them.

I not only commend but praise those splendid American citizens who, from time to time, contribute of their means to the American Red Cross fund. They are doing a great and a good work. But in this particular instance the distress is so widespread and general that the funds the Red Cross can raise immediately will not reach and relieve all the people who need to be reached and who must be reached and relieved at once.

Mr. President, prompt action by the Government to relieve these people will do much to strengthen their confidence in and their devotion to this great American Republic. They will say, "Well, the Government did not wait for the Red Cross alone to feed us; when our need was so great and our distress so general that the Red Cross could not in the time required meet the needs of hungry people, the Government joined hands with the Red Cross and supplied additional funds out of the Treasury of our country, instead of having us wait and starve until the money could be collected from those who are kind enough to give it."

Mr. President, when the railroads needed funds, as my colleague has pointed out, we did not tell them to go to private individuals and get aid; we did not tell them to rely upon the Red Cross; we did not tell them that it would be a bad example and a bad precedent for the Government to set of loaning money to private enterprise. Oh, no; it was all right then to lend money for their purposes, and the Government loaned \$500,000,000 to them.

Mr. President, it seems exceedingly small to me that Senators should stand here now and fight an appropriation of \$25,000,000 to provide food for the relief of people who are in dire distress when all of these other millions of dollars have been dished out to people who wanted the money to help their business, while those whom we are now proposing to aid need relief in order to keep from starving.

You know, Mr. President, every father and mother delights to be in a position to gratify the proper wants of their children. You know, when a little boy sees something that he wants and he goes to his daddy and asks him to buy it, if his request is refused, a look of disappointment is seen on his face, and the tears roll out and linger on the

brink of his eyelids and then run down his little troubled face. We have seen that. But, Mr. President, when that father gratifies that want that little fellow's face is wreathed in smiles and he is happy.

Senators, back in the 21 States about which I am talking to-day, little children are not asking their daddies to buy fascinating toys for them, but they are holding up their little, pale, thin hands and saying, "Daddy please get me something to eat, my bare feet are on the ground and I am so cold and hungry."

And there stands, sad and helpless, that sorely distressed daddy who has kept the wolf from the door in normal times when his strong arms were sustained by sufficient food and his fields were producing and good crops were being made. Mr. President, they never then called on daddy for something to eat in vain. Now the drought has destroyed his crop, his income, his means of support, and daddy is becoming desperate; he is a sad and sorrowful daddy because he hears and can not grant the requests of her who stood by his side at the altar place when he was married and pledged herself to go all along the way of life with him; she is the mother of his children, asking him for food for herself and children. Cold indeed is the heart that fails to sympathize with him and with her and their children in this hour of their distress and gloom.

Mr. President, in an extraordinary and distressing time like this, I can not understand how some public men about here can assume the strange and indifferent attitude that they do. I would remind them of the Scriptures, which says, "I will make a man more precious than gold."

I fear that some men about here in my immediate acquaintance have no god, except the god of gold; they are thinking how to protect the almighty dollar in the hands of the mighty rich. I want to be just and fair to all interests. I have always been and will always be fair to every legitimate interest.

Mr. President, in a time like this we have got no business halting and hesitating about going to the rescue of distressed people. Let us appropriate this money, turn it over to the American Red Cross as a supplement to the fund which they can raise. Let those fine and patriotic people in the Nation who are able and generous hearted answer the call of the President. And I commend President Hoover for appealing in behalf of the Red Cross for \$10,000,000 for the immediate relief of the millions who are in dire distress.

That, however, is not enough, and \$25,000,000 more appropriated by the Government will not be sufficient; but it will go a long way toward providing a sum sufficient to meet the needs of the hour.

Mr. President, let us do our duty and appropriate this money. I have before me a poem which on a previous occasion I read into the RECORD. I do not know who is the author of it, but I am reminded of it by the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT]. I read it now:

The politician talks and talks,
The actor plays his part;
The soldier glitters on parade,
The goldsmith plys his art.
The scientist pursues his germ
O'er the terrestrial ball,
The sailor navigates his ship,
But the farmer feeds them all.

The preacher pounds the pulpit desk,
The broker reads the tape;
The tailor cuts and sews his cloth
To fit the human shape.
The dame of fashion, dressed in silk,
Goes forth to dine, or call,
Or drive, or dance, or promenade,
But the farmer feeds them all.

The workman wields his shiny tools,
The merchant shows his wares;
The aeronaut above the clouds
A dizzy journey dares.
But art and science soon would fade,
And commerce dead would fall
If the farmer ceased to reap and sow,
But the farmer feeds them all.

Are we not now justified in going to the rescue of millions of farmers and their families who are in dire distress?

Here, Mr. President, we have opposition to a measure which would grant relief to the farmer when a drought has destroyed his crop and his efforts have been in vain. For the year 1930 in these sections there has been no fruit; no harvest has been reaped by him; he is in dire distress, and we know as a matter of fact that the Red Cross is not meeting the emergency, is not supplying adequately the needs of the hour. Then, why not go ahead and appropriate this money and take care of those who are in distress?

Mr. President, ill does it become Senators, rich in this world's goods, to stand and cold-bloodedly oppose a measure like this. Some say they are afraid we will make a mistake; they are afraid we will encourage people to come to the Public Treasury for funds.

When the mighty rich find their way to the Public Treasury the door opens to them when they knock; but when the distressed, toiling masses knock there is no response to them. There comes to my mind now a picture which Mr. Bryan drew of the big cities where live the mighty rich. He said:

Tear down your cities and leave your farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy your farms and grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country.

And that is true, Mr. President.

What do we find going on to-day? Wealth is becoming more and more concentrated in the hands of a few; a few people are becoming richer while thousands and hundreds of thousands are becoming poorer and poorer. With about 13 or 14 per cent of the population of our country owning 85 per cent of the wealth of this Nation, Senators, we are traveling down a very dangerous road. I want you to think about that.

Let us vote this amount for the relief of the farmers in the drought-stricken area of our country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas as modified.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|----------|----------|----------------|---------------|
| Ashurst | Fletcher | McGill | Simmons |
| Barkley | George | McKellar | Smith |
| Bingham | Gillett | McMaster | Smoot |
| Black | Glass | McNary | Stephens |
| Blaine | Goff | Metcalf | Swanson |
| Borah | Hale | Morrison | Thomas, Idaho |
| Bratton | Harris | Morrow | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bulkley | Harrison | Moses | Townsend |
| Capper | Hawes | Oddie | Trammell |
| Caraway | Hayden | Partridge | Tydings |
| Carey | Hebert | Patterson | Vandenberg |
| Connally | Heflin | Phipps | Wagner |
| Copeland | Johnson | Pine | Walsh, Mass. |
| Couzens | Jones | Pittman | Walsh, Mont. |
| Cutting | Kean | Robinson, Ark. | Watson |
| Dale | Kendrick | Sheppard | Williamson |
| Davis | Keyes | Shipstead | |
| Fess | King | Shortridge | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. [Putting the question.] By the sound the ayes seem to have it. The ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am sure there are some Senators absent who intended to be here to speak on this subject. I really think, in fairness, that the order should be vacated. This is the lunch hour. Two or more Senators whose names I recall spoke to me about their desire to speak.

Mr. McKELLAR. There was a roll call immediately before the vote, the Senator will recall.

Mr. McNARY. I understand that. That, however, does not always bring to the floor of the Senate, at this time of day, those who desire to speak.

It is not the purpose of anyone unnecessarily to delay the vote or to take quick and hasty judgment of the situation. I have no doubt of what the ultimate result will be; but I think it is fair that a full expression be had upon the amendment, and we may vote within the next hour or two.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which this amendment was adopted be reconsidered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the absence of a quorum was suggested, the roll was called, and immediately following that the vote was taken. If the Senator from Oregon now states that he desires to reopen the matter and to continue the debate, I think he ought to suggest an hour when the vote may be taken some time this afternoon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon as a matter of feeling probably entertains the same view as the Senator from Arkansas, as he favors the Senator's proposal. I am speaking only in behalf of those who, I am sure, wanted to be on the floor and speak before the final vote was taken.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. McNARY. I do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum and calling the roll was to give Senators an opportunity to be on the floor. I do not wish to take any advantage of any Senator.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not wish to close the debate if Senators feel that they want to continue the discussion; but in view of the fact that the roll was called, and no Senator was here who wanted to speak, and the Chair put the question and the amendment was adopted, I do think that I ought not to be asked to consent to a reconsideration with no time fixed for a vote; and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] has just suggested that he would not consent at all.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, at the time the vote was so quickly taken my attention was distracted by another Senator. Otherwise I should have gained possession of the floor and held it until some other Senators could be here. In view, however, of the fact that there is any reluctance at all on the part of the distinguished and able Senator from Arkansas to have a further consideration of this matter, and being unable to fix a time for a vote, I shall withdraw my request that the vote be vacated.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Oh, well, I am not content with that at all. The manifest implication is that some snap judgment is being taken here; and I do not intend to submit to that. The Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] suggests that I ought not to consent to reopen the matter.

So far as I am concerned, I am willing that any Senator who will rise on the floor and say that he desires to be heard on the amendment may have the opportunity of speaking to the amendment. There are some Senators on this side whom I had expected to hear, and who had expected to speak, but who did not rise because apparently they were ready for the vote.

Let us not, however, get any confusion of this sort in this issue. If the Senator from Oregon asks that the matter be reopened, so far as I am concerned, I shall consent to it. I do say, however, in view of the fact that after the roll call there was no one here offering to speak in opposition to the amendment, that we should vote to-day; and, so far as I have any voice in the matter, that course will be pursued.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. McNARY. Just a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. McNARY. I find myself in entire accord with the Senator from Arkansas. He is entitled to a vote to-day. I do not want to convey the implication that the matter was acted upon hastily or precipitately. I think that the Senator from Utah, who is in charge of the bill, should determine this matter; and, if he does not want a revocation of the vote, far be it from me to request it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I wish it understood that I have no objection.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am deeply interested in the passage of the Interior Department appropriation bill. If this bill passes, \$34,092,000 will be made immediately available. That is about the only relief that the Western States will get out of all the legislation proposed so far. We want to get to work immediately on our roads in the forests and upon the public lands. We want these items, and every Western State is interested in them. I know what the vote upon this amendment would be if it were taken over again.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What would it be?

Mr. SMOOT. I think it would be adopted.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Overwhelmingly?

Mr. SMOOT. Well, I say it would be adopted. Now, why undertake to put this off longer? I know what will occur when it goes to conference. I want this bill to become a law, so that at least the West will have \$34,000,000 immediately available, so that they can put men to work, because nearly the whole amount is for labor, and it goes directly there. For that reason, I will say to the Senator, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I desire to take just a moment on a matter on which I intended to speak before the recent vote was taken; and the remarks I shall make will be in the nature of an announcement.

The amendment just adopted provides for supplying food, medicine, medical aid, and so forth. At this time the War Department has a very large amount of clothing that is not in such condition that it can be used by the War Department. Application has been made for this clothing for distribution by charitable organizations. At this time I desire to submit for the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of War which explains how this clothing could be made available. I send to the desk a copy of a letter from Mr. Hurley and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 15, 1931.

HON. ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Receipt is acknowledged of your telegram of January 8, 1931.

The commanding generals of corps areas have been authorized to sell to accredited charitable organizations, by the lot at a nominal price, such available salvage clothing, shoes, and equipment as may be needed for the relief of the unemployed. These sales are to be made only to charitable organizations duly authorized by governors of States to make purchases, and each organization will be required to certify to the effect that uniform coats, overcoats, and caps will be dyed or otherwise changed in appearance so as to remove the distinctive character of the article and, further, to certify that all articles purchased will be given away and not resold.

It was suggested by the department in a letter addressed to Mr. Earl E. James, of the Elks Lodge, No. 147, Oklahoma City, Okla., on this subject, under date of January 8, 1931, that he get in touch with the Governor of Oklahoma. If the application of this lodge is approved by the governor, the commanding general of the Eighth Corps Area at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., upon request, will advise it of the quantities, condition, and location of the salvage articles available for sale to charitable organizations.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK J. HURLEY,
Secretary of War.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, that letter has to do with demands from the southwestern part of the country; but the letter is general. The principle and the plan suggested there are applicable to any part of the United States. The vast amount of cots, clothing, blankets, hats, caps, shoes, and so forth, can be had by charitable organizations for a nominal figure. While these goods are to be sold, yet the purchase price is of no consequence, and only a nominal figure will be exacted.

The letter just submitted has to do with clothing, in the main. I have a wire this morning asking whether or not

it can not be made possible that field kitchens owned by the War Department can be made available in certain cities for the use of the unemployed. I am advised that in some cities food can be secured without cost, and men can be secured without salaries to prepare the food for distribution, but for the want of places to cook the food and to serve it, this food can not be used.

I submitted the inquiry to the War Department, and am authorized by Mr. Hurley to state that if the governors of the States where need exists for this sort of equipment will make application to the respective corps area commanders, upon their request the equipment can be had.

In order to simplify the matter and to complete the record, I submit for the RECORD a telegram I have sent to one of my inquirers relative to this matter, and I also submit for the RECORD a copy of a telegram sent to the governor of my State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegrams will be printed in the RECORD.

The telegrams are as follows:

JANUARY 17, 1931.

IRA M. FINLEY,

543 West Pine Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

Replying to message advise have conferred with Secretary of War, Mr. Hurley, who advises that all equipment of War Department is available for loan to such communities as may be in need but only upon the request of the governors of the States affected. Hence suggest that you call on Governor Murray and request him to apply to corps area commander at Fort Sam Houston for such equipment as you may need. War Department wishes to cooperate fully in matter.

ELMER THOMAS.

JANUARY 17, 1931

HON. WILLIAM H. MURRAY,

Care of State Capitol, Oklahoma City, Okla.:

I have request from several organizations in State for the loan of War Department equipment, such as field kitchens and Army trucks to be used in serving food to the unemployed. Have conferred with Secretary of War Hurley, who advises that all War Department equipment is available for use upon request being made therefor by the governors of the respective States. Hence in future all similar requests must come to you and within your discretion you can submit the requests to corps area commander at Fort Sam Houston for such equipment as you think necessary.

ELMER THOMAS.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Oklahoma offers the following amendment, on page 52, line 16, after the word "school," to strike out the comma and insert a colon, and to strike out the remainder of the paragraph and add the following:

And provided further, That not to exceed \$10,000 may be expended, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, for the purpose of defraying the cost of operation of any special Indian public school which may be established for the education of Indian children in full-blood communities where there are not adequate white day schools available for their attendance.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this amendment does not increase the appropriation carried by the bill. The House included a provision in the bill that the department could use a part of the money appropriated for maintaining schools for Indian children. After the bill had passed the House and come to the Senate, Mr. HASTINGS, a Member of the House from Oklahoma, and himself a member of the Cherokee Tribe, asked the department to prepare an amendment to the bill as passed by the House to enable the department to employ teachers outside the civil service. The amendment just submitted was prepared by the Indian Bureau. I offer the amendment at the suggestion of Mr. HASTINGS.

This amendment was introduced just before the Christmas holidays, and desiring to have a later reaction of the bureau I sent the amendment to the Indian Bureau, asking for its suggestion. Evidently the first amendment and the reaction submitted to the amendment were not prepared by the same clerk in the Indian Bureau.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. This has reference to the Fort Sill School, does it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; it does not. It has reference to page 52, and the only purpose of the amendment is to enable the Indian Bureau to employ teachers in the Indian Service outside of the civil-service list. It does not increase the appropriation in any particular. I suggest to the Senator having the bill in charge to let this amendment pass and go to conference, and whatever agreement is reached in conference will be entirely satisfactory to me. I will say further that this amendment was prepared by Doctor Ryan, of the Indian Bureau, himself.

Mr. SMOOT. I have before me what the department suggests, and if the Senator will take his bill and follow it I will read exactly what the department suggests.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Before the Senator proceeds I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the entire statement made by the department in reply to my request for their reaction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT ON PAGE 52 CONCERNING OPERATION OF SPECIAL INDIAN DAY SCHOOLS

It is our understanding that the purpose of this amendment is to permit the employment of public-school teachers employed by the State rather than civil-service appointees. If so, the amendment proposed is somewhat broader than appears on its face, by reason of the fact that it would permit such things as purchase of schoolroom supplies, fuel, noonday lunches, and other items entering into the maintenance and operation of the school. We do not feel that the State should be relieved of its entire responsibility for educational work in these full-blood communities. We do feel, however, that some support should be given in the employment of teachers, but they should be employed by the State officials and not from a civil-service register. We would therefore suggest, in lieu of the amendment offered, the following:

Page 52, line 18, after the words "salaries of," insert the words "public school," and after the word "teachers" insert the words "employed by the State or county."

This change will permit the payment of salaries of teaching personnel only.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the department suggests that on page 52, line 18, after the words "salaries of," there be inserted the words "public school," and after the word "teachers" the words "employed by the State or county" be inserted. That is the amendment the department sends me, and to which it has no objection. Would that cover what the Senator desires?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I will say this, Mr. President, that Doctor Ryan, the head of the school system in the Indian Bureau, prepared my amendment. He was not in the city when the amendment the Senator suggests was prepared. I do not know which one they intend to follow. Both suggestions came from the bureau. I simply ask that the amendment be included in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I will accept the amendment, and let it go to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, at the time of the last quorum call the amendment of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] was pending. The amendment provided for the \$25,000,000 appropriation for the American Red Cross. I think it was generally known that some of us expected to speak on that subject, but when we sent to inquire the purpose of the quorum call, we were told it had been called by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] so that the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], who had announced his intention of speaking, might be heard. For that reason those of us who expected to speak on the amendment did not immediately report to the floor of the Senate.

I understand that the amendment was agreed to without a roll call and that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], who offered the amendment, has expressed his willingness to have the question reopened so that the matter

may be fully debated, and that a roll-call vote may be had; but I understand that objection has been made to that.

Mr. President, I desire now to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be entered.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I submit another amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 67, to strike out lines 4 to 25, inclusive, and on page 68, lines 1 to 4, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

There is hereby authorized to be expended, and to be by the Secretary of the Interior paid to E. J. Van Court, one of the attorneys for the Seminole Nation of Indians, employed under the authority of the act of Congress approved May 20, 1924 (43 Stat. L. 133), the sum of \$5,000, now standing to the credit of the Seminole Nation in the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That before payment is made there be obtained the agreement or consent thereto of the Seminole representative committee which was elected by the Seminoles under the provisions of section 2 of the above-mentioned act of May 20, 1924: *And provided further*, That, subject to all prior assignments and agreements as to division of fees, the sum so allowed and paid shall be reimbursable to the credit of Seminole funds out of any amount or amounts which may hereafter be decreed by the Court of Claims to be paid to the said E. J. Van Court, attorney, for his services and expenses rendered or incurred prior to the date of the approval of the act of May 20, 1924, above described, or out of his share of such fee or amount as may be awarded by the Court of Claims to the attorneys employed by the Seminole Nation under said act of May 20, 1924.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in order that the record may be complete, I submit at this point a statement from the Indian Bureau giving their opinion and recommendation relative to this amendment. I will not ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

EXPENSES OF ATTORNEYS IN CREEK SUIT

Under the provisions of section 2 of the act of May 24, 1924, the Creek Nation employed by contract dated December 8, 1924, E. J. Van Court and Messrs. Chamberlain and Nyce as its attorneys. The contract was approved by the department January 19, 1926, upon certain conditions which were accepted by the attorneys. The act provided that in no case should the fees be in excess of 10 per cent of the amount of the recovery, and the contract provided that the attorneys should pay the necessary expenses connected with their work. By the act of May 29, 1928, \$18,000 was appropriated from Creek tribal funds to be paid in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior to the attorneys for the Creek Nation, the payments to be in such sums as might be necessary to reimburse the attorneys for proper and necessary expenses that may have been or might be incurred by them in the investigation of records and preparation, institution, and prosecution of suits of the Creek Nation. Approximately \$17,872 has been paid to Mr. Van Court in reimbursement of his expenses. We are not willing to approve the amendment suggested unless there be included therein provisos similar to those contained in the original appropriation acts. We feel that the wording of the item as it appears in the bill as reported to the Senate is satisfactory, but if the amendment offered by Senator THOMAS should prevail, we would insist that it be amended by the addition of two provisos. We are attaching hereto a copy of the amendment with our proposed amendments thereto underscored.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, is what the Senator has just asked to have included in the RECORD what the department says should be adopted instead of the Senator's amendment?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No, Mr. President. What I have submitted is the department's recommendation. I have not introduced the department substitute for my amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I wanted to know whether that was the case.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I have just introduced the reaction of the department in a general way.

Mr. President, this amendment has to do with funds in the Federal Treasury to the credit of the Creek Nation, which in this bill are proposed to be appropriated for the benefit of attorneys having claims against the Government. The Creek Nation has numerous claims filed against the

Government. The Creek Nation has employed a firm of lawyers, Mr. Van Court and his associates, for the purposes of this amendment, to prosecute those claims. The Creek Nation has numerous suits—I can not say how many, but numerous suits—involving a very large sum of money. Mr. Van Court has been prosecuting those suits for years. For some reason he can not get the cases to trial. The Department of Justice is not able to join issue for the reason, it claims, that it can not get the necessary information from the Accounting Office. Mr. Van Court in prosecuting these claims has spent, he tells me, many thousands of dollars, and he has exhausted his resources.

Last year Congress passed a bill providing that money in the Treasury should be paid to a Mr. Boudinot in another case, on condition that the money should be paid to Mr. Boudinot, and that when he expended the funds he should submit an accounting. The item in the present bill provides that Mr. Van Court can expend his own money and then submit his vouchers and be reimbursed. But Mr. Van Court has exhausted his resources. He can not incur obligations and pay them at this time, and for that reason he is asking that the money be paid to him in advance, and after he spends it he will submit an accounting. That is the only item involved in this amendment, whether or not he shall be paid in advance, so that he can have the money to be used, or whether or not he will be forced to borrow the money and spend it and then submit vouchers and be reimbursed. That is the whole point involved in the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the department advises me that if any change is to be made in this item referred to by the Senator from Oklahoma it should be amended as follows: In line 10, after the words "1924 (43 Stat. 133-134)," to strike out the balance and insert the following:

Provided further, That the payments to be made shall be in such sums as may be necessary to reimburse said E. J. Van Court for such proper and necessary expenses as may have been incurred or may be incurred by him in the investigation of records and preparation, institution, or prosecution of suits of the Seminole Nation of Indians against the United States under the above-mentioned act of May 20, 1924: *And provided further*, That the claims for reimbursement for expenses shall be filed with the Secretary of the Interior and be accompanied by the attorney's itemized and verified statement of the expenditures for expenses by proper vouchers, and that the claims so submitted shall be subject to approval by the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further*—

Then the wording of the bill as reported to the Senate. If that will be satisfactory to the Senator, I will accept it; but I would have to make a point of order against his amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the suggestion made by the chairman of the committee is substantially the same as my amendment, and in order that the matter may go to conference I have no objection to the amendment suggested being substituted for the amendment offered by myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator modifies his amendment to carry out the suggestion of the Senator from Utah. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment. [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and the amendment is modified and agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I submit the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 66, strike out lines 3 to 25, inclusive, and on page 67 strike out lines 1, 2, and 3, and in lieu thereof insert the following—

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that there is a similarity between the two amendments. The department suggests after the numerals "1924" virtually the same provision as that to which we have just agreed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I modify my amendment as suggested by the Senator from Utah.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the modified amendment be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. The modified amendment reads as follows: On page 66, to strike out lines 3 to 25, and on page 67, strike out lines 1 to 3, and to insert:

There is hereby authorized to be expended and to be by the Secretary of the Interior paid to E. J. Van Court, one of the attorneys for the Creek Nation of Indians, employed under the authority of the act of Congress approved May 24, 1924 (43 Stat. L. 139), the sum of \$1,500 now standing to the credit of the Creek Nation in the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That before payment is made there be obtained the agreement or consent thereto of the Creek representative committee which was elected by the Creeks under the provisions of section 2 of the above-mentioned act of May 24, 1924: *Provided further*, That the payments to be made shall be made in such sums as may have been incurred or may be incurred by him in the investigation of records and preparation, institution, or prosecution of suits of the Creek Nation of Indians against the United States under the above-mentioned act of May 24, 1924: *And provided further*, That the claims for reimbursement for expenses shall be filed with the Secretary of the Interior and be accompanied by the attorney's itemized and verified statement of the expenditures for expenses by proper voucher, and that the claims so submitted shall be subject to approval of the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further*, That, subject to all prior assignments and agreements as to division of fees, the sum so allowed and paid shall be reimbursable to the credit of Creek funds out of any amount or amounts which may hereafter be decreed by the Court of Claims to be paid to the said E. J. Van Court, attorney, for his services and expenses rendered or incurred prior to the date of the approval of the act of May 24, 1924, above described, or out of his share of such fee or amount as may be awarded by the Court of Claims to the attorneys employed by the Creek Nation under said act of May 24, 1924.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified. [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and the amendment as modified is agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 43, line 19, add the following:

Pawnee, Okla.: For school building, auditorium, and gymnasium, including equipment, \$60,000; for heating plant, \$20,000; for converting present school building into dormitory, \$5,000; in all, \$85,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there has been no estimate made for this amount, and therefore I am compelled to make the point of order against the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Before the point of order is sustained I wish to be heard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may be heard.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I submit that it is not necessary under the rules of the Senate or under the law for an estimate to be submitted in order to make an amendment in order at this particular time and place.

Mr. SMOOT. In order that the Chair may have the whole subject matter before him, let me say that there is no estimate made by the bureau. It is an amendment to an appropriation bill increasing the appropriation and no estimate has been made for it by the Budget.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am unfamiliar with any law that requires an estimate to be made from any source.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply call that to the attention of the Chair. So far as that is concerned, it is an amendment on an appropriation bill that has not been estimated for and is not in conformity with the rules of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I will admit that the item did not come to the Senate from the Budget Bureau. I submit that it is not necessary for the Budget to send an estimate to the Senate in order to give a Member of this body the privilege and the legal right to submit an amendment to an appropriation bill, provided the amendment is in accordance with the law, if it is authorized by law.

The Snyder Act is under the following title:

An act authorizing appropriations and expenditures for the administration of Indian affairs, and for other purposes.

It is an act which was approved November 2, 1921. In this act we find this special authorization:

For the enlargement, extension, improvement, and repair of the buildings and grounds of existing plants and projects.

The Pawnee Indian School is an existing plant and project. This amendment simply provides the money for the

construction of additional buildings there for the proper care of Indian children under the authorization. I submit that the amendment is authorized under this general law.

I submit further that it is not necessary to have the Budget send down an estimate in order to make the amendment in order. The Budget has nothing to do with the legality of passing appropriations through this body.

Mr. SMOOT. Congress has authorized millions and millions of dollars for various purposes, and perhaps half of them are never appropriated for. That is simply an authorization; it is not an appropriation at all. It merely provides that hereafter, if Congress wants to act upon that authorization, it can do so through an appropriation bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. And this is an appropriation bill and here is the authorization.

Mr. SMOOT. But before it goes into the appropriation bill the Budget Bureau must have recommended it or it must have been passed by one or the other of the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I submit to the Chair the Budget law. We find paragraph 8 of section 201 reads as follows:

The President shall transmit to the Congress on the first day of each regular session a budget which shall set forth in summary and in detail (a) estimates of expenditures in appropriations necessary in his judgment for the support of the Government for the ensuing fiscal year.

The Budget Bureau is simply an agency of the President. It is not an agency of the Government. It is an agency of the President to enable him to make his recommendations to Congress. It is not necessary, I hold, for the Congress to have a Budget estimate submitted to this body for the particular purpose of giving it authority to introduce an amendment to an appropriation bill.

During recent years objections and points of order have been raised suggesting that because the Budget Bureau has not submitted an estimate, a particular item is not in order. I think that ruling should be challenged. I think points of order made on that proposition are not valid. If that is a good objection, then the Budget Bureau becomes the controller of the purse string of the people of the United States. That is not the law. That is not intended to be the law.

Mr. SMOOT. If the item had been acted on by either House or recommended by a standing committee, then it could be acted upon; but it has not been. It is just an authorization similar to authorizations for the expenditure of millions of dollars which perhaps sometime in the future will be appropriated for. But it can not be appropriated for until first submitted to the Budget and the recommendation of the Budget made, unless it passes one or the other of the two bodies of Congress, and then it is in order.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I take the position that the Senate is not bound in any sense or in any particular by a Budget estimate. I hold that a Member of the Senate is not prevented from introducing amendments to appropriation bills unless and until the Budget submits an estimate.

Just a word further before the Chair rules. I admit that the Budget Bureau has not submitted an estimate concerning this item. I submit that the Indian Bureau has not submitted an estimate. I submit that the employees of the Indian Bureau have submitted estimates. I have the estimates here. I will submit at the proper time a request coming from the Indian Bureau that the item be included in the bill. The Indian Bureau is in favor of the item.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BRATTON. I am unable to agree with the statement just made by the Senator from Utah. Rule 16 of the Senate provides that—

All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill or to add a

new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law or treaty stipulation or act—

And so forth.

If an act has been passed authorizing an appropriation, and an amendment to a general appropriation bill is proposed on the floor to carry out the provisions contained in the authorizing act, I submit to the Chair that such an amendment is in order, and that accordingly the statement just made by the Senator from Utah is incorrect. It is my understanding that an amendment falls under the ban of the rule if it is to increase an appropriation beyond the authorization or if it is offered without any authorizing act. If the statement made by the Senator from Oklahoma to the effect that this amendment is in conformity with the so-called Snyder Act and carries out an appropriation authorized in that act is correct, I submit that it is in order and does not violate the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. May the Chair ask the Senator from New Mexico his judgment of the Snyder Act? Does it authorize the use of money to be appropriated or does it authorize the appropriation of money?

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I have not read the Snyder Act. I address my remarks primarily to the general statement made by the Senator from Utah that although a previous act may have authorized an appropriation, an amendment to carry that authorization into effect is not in order unless it has been approved by the Budget. I dissent from that statement with respect to the effect of the rule.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator did not read the whole rule. If he had continued the reading, he would see that it does apply to the Snyder Act. The Senator stopped too soon. The rule continues:

Or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session.

Mr. BRATTON. Precisely. It reads "or" not "and." In other words, if an act was passed at a previous session authorizing an appropriation or if a measure has passed the Senate during this session, but has not passed the House, in either event an amendment in accordance therewith is in order.

If the Snyder Act had passed this body during this session of the Congress and were pending in the House, the amendment would be in order. The two provisions in the rule are not conjoined. They are disjunctive and relate to different situations. An amendment is in order under either of them.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Two years ago I offered an amendment in this body providing for the appropriation of \$90,000 to build an addition to the Fort Sill Indian Hospital. At that time a similar objection was made and a point of order raised, and the Chair held that under the Snyder Act the amendment was in order. The Senate adopted the amendment, the House agreed to it, and the hospital has been extended under that appropriation.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not recall the circumstance alluded to by the Senator. It may have been that one of the Houses had acted at that session upon the particular item. Of course, in that event, the item would have been in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will request the clerk again to read the act.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[Public No. 85, Sixty-seventh Congress]
H. R. 7848

An act authorizing appropriations and expenditures for the administration of Indian affairs, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Bureau of Indian Affairs, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, shall direct, supervise, and expend such moneys as Congress may from time to time appropriate, for the benefit, care, and assistance of the Indians throughout the United States, for the following purposes:

General support and civilization, including education.

For relief of distress and conservation of health.

For industrial assistance and advancement and general administration of Indian property.

For extension, improvement, operation, and maintenance of existing Indian irrigation systems and for development of water supplies.

For the enlargement, extension, improvement, and repair of the buildings and grounds of existing plants and projects.

For the employment of inspectors, supervisors, superintendents, clerks, field matrons, farmers, physicians, Indian police, Indian judges, and other employees.

For the suppression of traffic in intoxicating liquor and deleterious drugs.

For the purchase of horse-drawn and motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use.

And for general and incidental expenses in connection with the administration of Indian affairs.

Approved, November 2, 1921.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that that is not an authorization for an appropriation but authorizes the expenditure of money appropriated, and he therefore sustains the point of order.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

Messages from the President of the United States making nominations were referred to the appropriate committees.

EXPENSES OF INTERNATIONAL GEOLOGICAL CONGRESS (S. DOC. NO. 254)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VANDENBERG in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the inclosed report from the Secretary of State to the end that legislation may be enacted to authorize an appropriation of \$110,000 for the expenses of the Sixteenth Session of the International Geological Congress to be held in the United States in 1932.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 17, 1931.
(Inclosure: Report.)

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of to-day's business the Senate take a recess until Monday at 11 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14675) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 63, lines 16 and 17, it is proposed to strike out "Kiowa, Commanche, and Apache, \$51,000," and on page 60, line 7, to strike out the figures "\$1,292,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,343,000."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, before addressing myself to the amendment just submitted, I desire to have inserted in the RECORD the request for the money just denied by reason of the point of order being sustained. I desire to have the memorandum printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The memorandum is as follows:

PAWNEE SCHOOL, OKLAHOMA

In view of our general public-school policy for Indian children wherever practicable, and the cooperative attitude of the Oklahoma State Department of Education, we have been somewhat reluctant to undertake any large amount of construction except where use of the plant is indicated for some time to come or a definite policy has been worked out. The proposed construction at Pawnee is regarded as consistent with this policy and arrangements are being perfected for public-school attendance at Pawnee of pupils above the third grade. It is quite doubtful, however, that the amount is sufficient for the various purposes indicated. We would suggest not less than \$60,000 for school building, auditorium, and gymnasium, including equipment, and \$20,000 for the heating plant. Also, the proviso that the buildings shall be constructed of native stone in the open market is not desirable. This proviso eliminates any possibility of competition either in the purchase of building materials other than native stone or the construction of the buildings by contract. It is noted that the amendment is offered for consideration in connection with the schools under the heading of nonreservation boarding schools. We are in sympathy with the

proposed improvements at the Pawnee School and recommend that the amendment offered by Senator THOMAS be changed to read as follows:

On page 43, line 19, after the figures "\$35,000," insert:

"Pawnee, Okla.: For school building, auditorium, and gymnasium, including equipment, \$60,000; for heating plant, \$20,000; for converting present school building into dormitory, \$5,000; in all, \$85,000."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. At this point, Mr. President, I desire also to submit a report made by the supervisor of Indian education, Samuel H. Thompson, addressed to the Commissioner on Indian Affairs. This report has to do with the Pawnee situation, and in order that the conditions at this school may be understood, I desire to read the report. It is as follows:

DECEMBER 6, 1930.

COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I beg to submit a preliminary report on the Pawnee jurisdiction in Oklahoma. The field work has been done, or practically all of it, and while there is not time to write up the various family histories the information given herein will doubtless be of some value.

I found 310 families with 769 children enrolled in some school, 35 of whom are more than 18 years of age but in school. There are 178 orphans, of whom 18 have both parents dead. I attach herewith a table giving not only the statistics on families by tribes covered in this jurisdiction but also a recapitulation. Thinking it might be of further interest I am attaching copies of letters to Principal Chief Ben Dwight and Doctor Ryan on the Choctaw and Chickasaw families and children.

Relative to the Pawnee jurisdiction, let me say that it is my understanding that various recommendations have come up from various traveling officials and also the local people in charge recommending increasing the capacity of the Pawnee Indian School to 400, involving appropriations running as high as around \$200,000. Keeping in mind the general office policy and what all people seem to consider the ideal, and rightly so, in my opinion, namely, that we should strive as early as practical to place as many Indian children in public schools as possible, I feel that the following situation, which may be considered a recommendation, should be given most careful consideration: It would be possible to take care of the Pawnee jurisdiction splendidly if it were not for the Ponca Tribe of Indians. Families with school children number 94, with 226 children of school age. Sixty-five of these are orphans, 10 having both parents dead. Of these, 98 are enrolled in the public schools of the jurisdiction in which they live. Twenty-eight are out for various reasons, leaving 120 that are now being cared for either in our Indian schools or a mission school. The family life of the Poncas is deplorable. I was in many of the homes, and found some of them without any article of furniture whatsoever in the rooms where I was received. The parents seemed to be irresponsible, and I am told by Superintendent Snyder and others that property purchased for them is carried off and pawned, and in some instances when food has been purchased the parents have been known to trade it for intoxicants, so Superintendent Snyder informs me.

This situation, in my opinion, may be handled in either of two ways, whichever may be considered the more practical. Keeping in mind that it is desirable to preserve the home life of the Indians, if it were practical to furnish these families food, clothing, and books at home and permit them to go to public school, that would solve the problem and perhaps would be the most economical way. Those more experienced in Indian home life than I seem to think that that would establish more firmly the dole system, and that if a certain amount, say, \$3 to \$5 a week, should be given these families other Indians not entitled to such benefits would come in and live with them. That is probably true. Then I see no practical way of administering such funds.

The other way would be to enlarge the plant at the Pawnee Indian School in a small way. I do not believe the capacity of this plant should be more than 300 students. This could be done by an appropriation of \$40,000 for a building, to be built out of native stone in the open market, said building to contain five or six school rooms, a small auditorium to seat about 300, and a small gymnasium. Superintendent Snyder thinks, after his experience with building the hospital out of native stone in open market, that he could erect a school building under the conditions above mentioned for the amount mentioned. My Snyder thinks that he saved a minimum of \$25,000 in the erection of the hospital at a cost of \$92,500. Dr. Walter S. Stevens thinks this is too conservative and that anyway \$50,000 has been saved.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, what the Senator from Oklahoma is reading has no reference to the Indians provided for in the pending amendment, has it? As I understand, what he is reading relates to the Pawnee Indians.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I have not represented otherwise.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought the Senator was speaking on the amendment now pending.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I said when I began that I would take some little time to make the record supporting the amendment that was rejected by the point of order being sustained.

Mr. SMOOT. I was wondering whether I was wrong or not; that was all.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I might say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that this is the only way I can get this matter before the Congress. For years this demand has been pending for an addition to this school building. No attention has been paid to it. We have gone to the Indian Bureau and made appeals, but our appeals have fallen on deaf ears. This year when a committee of the Senate was about to visit my State, the Indian Bureau got busy and sent a man to Oklahoma. He made an exhaustive investigation, and I have now his report, which I am presenting to the Senate and to the Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the Senator does not think for a moment that I was objecting to his doing so; but, as I understood the report being read by him, it did not seem to apply to the amendment which was pending, and I wanted to be sure of that. That is why I asked the Senator the question.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Does the Senator submit a point of order against my remarks?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no, not at all; I have no such desire.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Continuing, the report says:

In addition to the \$40,000 there would need to be a sum of about \$5,000 to convert the present school building into dormitories and to equip them. Then a central heating plant to cost \$15,000 is badly needed. In fact, the heating conditions there are the most deplorable of any place I have been. All buildings, including the dormitories for the children, are heated by small gas stoves, and the superintendent feels it is impossible to make the children comfortable, and that certainly seems so to me. I believe all the buildings there, with one exception, are of native stone. In the girls' building, in addition to dormitory space for the girls, there is a dining room accommodating now 217 children, the kitchen, the girls' play room, and the music room, and the 111 girls sleep there. The girls' washroom is also there and all cooking is done there except the baking, which is done in a bake shop outside, together with the milk room. This building is about 43 years old and has been repaired often. They have two new buildings, erected in 1927, one for employees and the other is called the new academic building, in which there is the principal's office, 8 by 12 feet, and the second and third grade rooms. The old stone academic building is 17 years old and has the beginners and fourth grades and a small, poorly lighted chapel seating 150. The commissary is in the basement of this building. This building, in my opinion, should be made into a dining room under the building plan above suggested. There is an old frame building which was condemned when Superintendent Snyder came there, he tells me, but which he could not do without. It leans considerably from the perpendicular, is propped, and has been reinforced with some new foundation. Three employees live upstairs in this building and there is one classroom downstairs. The building is not plastered, has an outside stairway to get to the rooms on the second floor, and is in no way satisfactory. Another building has a family living in it, a primary recitation room therein, and a guest room. It is an old building. All of these buildings are heated by gas stoves, entirely unsatisfactory.

Now, if this building program should be carried out it should be with the understanding that all the children there, with the exception of the first, second, and third grades, should be placed in the Pawnee city school where we now have 49 who live at our dormitory and attend this school. They are very satisfactory pupils. Out of 53 from our school in this school last year only 1 failed to make a passing grade. City Superintendent Otto C. Lucy advises that he can take care of all of ours above the third grade, and the boys' adviser at the school, who conveys the children back and forth, says that he can take care of 100 with the school bus as well as 50. I did not tell him what I had in mind when I asked him about this. I might also suggest that it might not be a bad idea to place our teaching at the Indian school under the direction of the city superintendent of Pawnee if he would be willing to so do.

In addition to getting more of our children in the public schools and keeping them in all the time if this money could be made available during this session of Congress it would help the unemployment situation locally very much. Superintendent Snyder has used many of the Indians in erecting the hospital, and I saw several employed there recently putting the hospital grounds in condition.

I do not feel like saying too much on paper as to what appeared to me to be the unmoral condition of several of these Indian families, but I do not feel that even that relieves the Government from its responsibility to the children. Speaking from the point of one interested in society and in the next adult generation it seems to me that to leave these children in such homes

as these appeared to be and as others familiar with the situation tell me they are, would make it impossible to expect these Indian children to grow up to be responsible men and women who would take their places and be acceptable to good citizenship.

I simply state these two ways of handling the situation without particularly recommending either way but stating the first—that is, continuing the home life—is much more desirable if a practical way can be found to administer it; but with poverty on every hand, accompanied by the irresponsibility of parents, it seems to me that the most desirable way at the present time is to get the \$60,000 immediately if it can be done. My own opinion is that the office would never have to spend any more money at the Pawnee Indian School until such time as the State would take care of all the children in public schools except, of course, for upkeep.

There is one little schoolhouse in Pawnee County at Valley Grove that has 54 children in one room, 27 of whom are Indian children. This is entirely too many, and the room is too small to get enough seats in. I found children sitting on goods boxes and doubled up on seats. I would suggest that the Government aid the public-school officials of this community in erecting an addition to the building at a cost of about \$1,500 or erecting a new school building in another part of this school district, which would cost about \$2,500. That would keep these children in the public school.

A copy of this report is being sent to Superintendent A. R. Snyder, Pawnee Indian Agency, Pawnee, Okla.

A more extended report will be given when there is time to classify the families.

Respectfully yours,

SAMUEL H. THOMPSON,
Supervisor Indian Education.

I submit this, Mr. President, in justification of the amendment I offered a moment ago; but, under the procedure of the Congress, a Member's hands are tied here. We can get no action from the Indian Bureau, no action from the Budget, no action from the committee, and when the matter comes up on the floor a point of order is made and is sustained. In what position does that place these helpless Indian children located throughout the United States?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Does anybody question the facts as set forth in the report which the Senator has just read?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. This report comes from the Indian Bureau, but the bureau is unwilling to act upon this recommendation.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. My question invites this answer, if it be correct, namely, that nobody questions the facts as therein set forth.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I do not.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. If that is a correct statement of the facts, why should we raise a point of order to considering the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma? I know of no constitutional provision that commands the chairman of the committee or the Senator who is in charge of this bill to raise a point of order; and I rise, even thus belatedly, to suggest that the Senator in charge of this bill, if under the rule he may do so, withdraw his point of order so that the suggested amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma may be considered on its merits.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma has not been speaking to the amendment that is now before the Senate.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. The Senator has been reading a report touching a matter concerning which a point of order was raised; and the Chair, probably correctly, sustained the point of order. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. SMOOT. I am sorry the Senator has not charge of the bill.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I regret that I have not charge of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator has not.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. No; I am aware that I have not. Some day I may have.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Had the point of order not been made, and thereafter had it not been sustained, I should have been content to have the Senate pass upon the merits of this proposal. Since the point was made and

sustained, however, I have no option but to inflict myself upon the Senate in portraying some of the conditions that exist among some of these Indian tribes.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I may have displayed too much feeling. I made those observations in the hope that the Senator in charge of the bill would, if he could under the procedure, have the matter reopened so that no point of order would be raised, and this matter might be determined on its merits.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am following out the instructions of my committee. That is what I am going to do, or else they can remove me from the committee; that is all.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. What committee?

Mr. SMOOT. The Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have some information which I shall give this afternoon which I think will be interesting to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

After the Pawnee amendment should have been disposed of, it was my purpose to offer a second amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read in my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 43, after line 19, add the following:

Fort Sill Indian School, Oklahoma: For school building, embracing schoolrooms, auditorium, and gymnasium, \$40,000; for machine shop and equipment, \$10,000; for boys' dormitory, \$30,000; for girls' dormitory, \$30,000; for repair and improvement, \$3,000; and for employees' building, \$14,000; in all, \$127,000: *Provided*, That after June 30, 1931, the Fort Sill Indian School shall be transferred from the jurisdiction of the superintendent of the Kiowa Agency to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if that amendment could have been submitted in regular form and could have come before the Senate, I intended to submit some remarks in advocacy of the amendment; but since a point of order would have been made, and since the point of order would have been sustained, I will submit the remarks anyway.

This is a school located in my own county, a place where I have lived for 30 years. I think I know conditions there. I know the Indians. Appeals have been made from time to time for these Indians, and these appeals have not been heeded, although the Secretary of the Interior knows nothing about the conditions. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs knows nothing about the conditions. One-half the Indian population of the United States reside in Oklahoma, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has never been in that State. He knows nothing of the conditions there. When our committee went there last fall he was urged and invited by numerous members of the committee and citizens and agents and superintendents to come with it. He did not come. In 12 days' time the Secretary or his assistant could have made a survey of Oklahoma, of its 150,000 Indian citizens, of its fifty-odd tribes, and could have gained some firsthand information. He did not go, and as a result he knows nothing about these conditions.

The Indian Bureau must depend upon the report of its agents and superintendents about these matters; and the superintendent is in favor of these improvements. The amendment I have just had read is for the Fort Sill Indian School. Let me now call the attention of the Senate to what the superintendent says about this institution—not the school superintendent but the agency superintendent. He submits a memorandum, the title-page of which reads:

MEMORANDUM REGARDING FORT SILL BOARDING SCHOOL, FORT SILL, OKLA.

Improvements needed to bring the Fort Sill Boarding School up to a well-balanced institution, carrying from the first to the tenth grades, inclusive, and having a capacity for 200 pupils.

Approximate amount needed for improvements, \$96,500.

I desire at this time to read the recommendations of the agent and superintendent, the only source of information that the Indian Bureau can have. They will not go there themselves. They have not done it. They will not depend upon the reports made by their own local superintendents. If they had, they would have asked the Budget to estimate

an amount for the Fort Sill School. If they had followed the recommendation of their own agency, they would have submitted an estimate to the Budget Bureau for the Pawnee Indian School. They have not done it.

Mr. Buntin, the superintendent of the Kiowa-Comanche-Apache Agency, located at Anadarko, Okla.—and, by the way, he is more than that; he is the supervisor of a whole area of agencies in that section of the country, a man who stands high in the estimation of the Indian Bureau—makes this report; and yet it has no attention at the Budget Bureau, and when it comes here it can not be heard excepting, in a sense, out of order:

MEMORANDUM

Improvements needed to bring the Fort Sill Boarding School up to a well-balanced institution, carrying from the first to the tenth grades, inclusive, and having a capacity for 200 pupils.

1. Classroom space should be increased by the construction of two more schoolrooms of reinforced tile and matt-faced brick, with a half basement under one of the rooms to be used as a sewing room.

Estimated cost..... \$8,000

2. Gymnasium and auditorium combined should be constructed of reinforced hollow tile and matt-faced brick.

Estimated cost..... \$25,000

3. One cottage for the principal.

Estimated cost..... \$3,500

4. One shop building and equipment for use of shop instructor.

Estimated cost..... \$4,000

5. Miscellaneous repairs, including general repairs to buildings, water, sewer, and lighting systems, beautifying of grounds, building of sidewalks, driveways, etc.

Estimated cost..... \$6,000

6. Increase dormitory space for girls and boys by the construction of one dormitory each for them, having a capacity for 30 girls and 30 boys, so constructed with wardrobes that 2 pupils might occupy 1 room. The buildings to contain half basements, each to be two stories, constructed of reinforced hollow tile and matt-faced brick, heated by low-pressure boilers, lighted by electricity, and provided with water and sewer system.

Estimated cost (\$25,000 each)..... \$50,000

Here is what Mr. Buntin says in support of these items, his justification; and he is a high-ranking official of the Indian Bureau, but is not sufficiently high to reach men in authority there who have little, if any, sympathy with the charges under their control.

JUSTIFICATION

The completion of such improvements as listed above would bring the Fort Sill Boarding School up to a well-balanced institution having a capacity for 200 pupils. It would be practicable to include the grades from the first to the tenth, or leave out the first three grades and take pupils from the fourth to the twelfth grades, inclusive, thus making the school into a high school.

There are approximately 1,600 eligible children on the Kiowa Reservation.

Sixteen hundred children on that reservation! Thirty years ago these Indians lived in tepees and tents. There was not a house in that vast area. They are called wild Indians by the Indian Bureau. It is true that they do wear an occasional blanket. It is true that occasionally you see one in a show dressed with his moccasins and his buckskin suit. These Indians have had only 30 years' contact with the white race. There are 1,600 children on that reservation, and yet the Government is unwilling to provide a school to take care of 200 of them!

There are approximately 1,600 eligible children on the Kiowa Reservation. It is estimated that approximately 1,000 of the children may be cared for in public schools.

That leaves 600 of these Indian children who can not get in the public schools; and yet the Government is unwilling to provide a school to take care of 200 of the orphans and the poorer classes among the children of that reservation!

A considerable number of the children will have to be taken care of in the Government schools for many years to come for the reason the parents are without sufficient funds with which to provide the children with the necessities of life to enable them to creditably attend the public schools.

The Fort Sill Boarding School is conveniently located for the Comanche Tribe, numbering approximately 1,920, and for a number of the Kiowa-Apaches. The location of the school is within 300 yards of the Kiowa Hospital. This is an important item, as it affords an excellent opportunity to look after the health conditions of the pupils of the school.

At the Fort Sill institution they have a thousand acres of fine land, upland and bottom land, with timber here and there, within 300 yards of this school. There is a fine hospital there that cost something like \$200,000, modern in every particular; and the superintendent says that this is an elegant place for the building of the school, because it is close to this hospital:

There are approximately 1,000 acres of land reserved for the use of the school. The school is excellently located 1 mile north of Lawton. The electric current for the use of the school is furnished by the Southwestern Power & Light Co., which is located in the city of Lawton. The water for the school is supplied by the city of Lawton, without cost to the Government, from Lake Lawtonka. Lake Lawtonka has been formed by the construction of a concrete dam across an opening between two mountains, thus forming a lake 70 feet in depth at the dam and extending back for a distance of approximately 6 miles. This is one of the best water supplies in southern Oklahoma.

The large number of Indian children of nearly full blood needing a school of this kind, the location so near the Kiowa Hospital, and the excellent water supply make it important that the Fort Sill School be improved and converted into a well-balanced Government school for the children of approximately 5,500 Indians under the Kiowa Agency.

This is a report submitted by Mr. Buntin. There are three classes of Indians there, embracing a total of 5,500 members, 1,600 children, and 600 can not get into the public schools. They are not qualified, they can not get in, they have no funds, the parents can not clothe their children, there are no provisions for orphan children.

Mr. President, I hope I may have the attention of the distinguished Senator having the bill in charge. I want to submit a report from one of the bureau officials. This is not from the chamber of commerce report, this is from an inspector of the Interior Department, signed by Mr. Charles J. Smith, inspector, Interior Department. I call it to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Utah. This report came in on December 10, 1930, addressed to the honorable Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C., and reads as follows:

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER: In compliance with memorandum under inclosure 231,130, relating to conditions existing under the Kiowa Agency, I beg leave to make the following report:

FORT SILL INDIAN SCHOOL

After thoroughly going over the building and grounds of the Fort Sill Indian School, I find a number of urgent needs that should receive immediate attention and will be necessary before this plant can function properly as an educational institution.

This school is located on a beautiful site and has an Indian school population that is not being properly served on account of the lack of facilities provided. At no other section in the State of Oklahoma have I found the parents of the Indian children so anxious and interested for the department to provide proper schooling facilities for their children. The majority of these parents stated to me that they realize the value of an education, citing their own predicament, many of them having reached no higher than the third grade.

CLASSROOMS AND TEACHERS

The Fort Sill School attempts to offer work in grades from the first to the ninth inclusive, and has a number of beginners enrolled.

Most of the classrooms are crowded. Forty-five pupils are in the third and fourth grades, which are assigned to one teacher. There are only five teachers for the nine grades, and one of these is doing the work usually assigned to an auditorium teacher. At no other institution have I found such loyalty as displayed by these teachers; one, an Indian, going to the woods gathering pecans and selling them to purchase crayons, etc., for the use in her classes; the others using their personal funds for like purposes.

Mr. President, through the niggardly policy of the Government in these Indian schools, teachers take their pupils into the woods and gather nuts and sell them, and use the money to purchase crayons and paper for the use of the Indian children. I now exhibit to the distinguished Senator from Utah, having the bill in charge, a picture made by one of the pupils in that school, made with paint and on paper, obtained as the result of the children gathering pecans in the woods and forests of Oklahoma, and selling them upon the market, getting a few meager cents with which to purchase material to do this class of work.

There should be at least two more teachers and two more classrooms, to care for the nine grades properly. The curriculum of this school should be extended to include the full high school course, and I would recommend that the department give this

matter the consideration it deserves, especially on account of the ideal location, Indian population, and many acres of fertile soil adjoining the school.

The Indians of this section feel that this locality has long been neglected and the system of educating their children at this school has deteriorated rather than progressed.

INDIAN HOMES

I spent several days in visiting the Indian homes with Superintendent Buntin, Government farmers, Mr. Roland Croft, and Mr. H. L. Rice; and found a number of children of school age that were not attending school. Some had been refused admission on account of the overcrowded condition of the school at Fort Sill.

Indian children on this reservation applied by the score for admission last fall, but were turned away. There are no facilities there for any more. The children can not enter the public schools in many places, many of them can not speak the English language sufficiently, the parents have not funds with which to clothe their children, they have not means with which to buy them lunches and keep them in school, and last year the children were turned away by the score.

Others were barefoot and were without shoes and sufficient clothing, so could not attend public school. A number of the smaller children live too far to attend the public schools in their locality.

Some of the homes visited were very poorly furnished, having no beds and the entire family sleeping on the floors with no coverings.

This is not the report of a promoter; this is not a chamber of commerce report; this is a report submitted by an inspector of the Interior Department, made within the past 60 days.

I also found a number of these families living in old tents and teepees, with scarcely any food and no comforts.

LAUNDRY

The space and equipment in this department is entirely inadequate to meet the needs of the school. The washer in the laundry is in bad shape. The drum is so worn that it will not hold the clothing, many holes being in the outside drum.

Imagine, Mr. President, the great United States Government having an Indian school, and at that Indian school providing a laundry by which the clothing of the children is supposed to be kept clean, and the drum in that laundry so full of holes that it will not even hold the clothing.

I understand this washer has been in use for many years. The tubs in the laundry are old and all leak. The plumbing is also in bad condition, the faucets are leaking. The mangle iron has been in use for many years and is too small for a school of this size. The hot-water tank in the laundry is out of repair and they have not been able to use it for over a year. The drier in the laundry is of practically no use, being of an old design and entirely too small to take care of the needs of the school. The laundry is cramped for space on account of the sewing room occupying one end of the laundry building. There is only one employee and an assistant should be provided for.

Imagine this laundry, the drum being so full of holes that it will not hold the clothing, and one employee to manage the institution.

There is a lack of suitable quarters for employees at this school. One of the laborers' rooms is in the school building. The dairyman has a room in a small cottage occupied by the engineer and his wife. This is an unsatisfactory arrangement and it interferes with the privacy in the home.

There is no inside toilet for the dairyman and he is compelled to carry water for cleansing purposes from another building. One of the lady assistants has a room in the girls' building, a room that could be well used for a private or individual room for the girls.

GYMNASIUM AND AUDITORIUM

The students in this school take an active interest in athletics, but have no suitable building or place to practice. The girls' basket-ball teams are compelled to practice on the school grounds, and at this time of the year the weather is usually cold and the ground damp or muddy. This is true of the boys' team also.

Occasionally during the basket-ball season, the pupils are allowed to use the courts in the public-school buildings at Lawton, two miles distant. Without this indoor practice the children feel that they could not compete with other schools in this section. Great pride is taken by them in their teams and suitable quarters should be provided.

I would recommend that a new building for auditorium and gymnasium purposes be erected at this school. The present auditorium is too small now to accommodate all of the students.

The stage is small and does not provide suitable space for entertainment purposes. The parents of the children and the citizens of Lawton are prevented from enjoying and attending the entertainments, as it is impossible to provide space for them.

This condition is discouraging to the teachers, being unable to have their work witnessed by the parents and friends of the school.

SHOP BUILDING

Here is the kind of a shop this magnificent Government provides for its Indian wards:

There is a small frame building at this school called the shop building. It contains no equipment or machinery of any kind.

A shop building with no equipment or machinery of any kind.

A shop building should be erected for this school and provided with space for the instructor, carpenter and shoe-repairing department. The building should be supplied with some modern machinery, as it is impossible to keep up the repair work of this school without some labor-saving machinery. The general condition of the buildings at this school showed neglect. If a shoe-repairing department was established here it would not only teach the boys a useful trade, but pay for itself in the repairing and mending of shoes.

AUTOMOBILE

There is no car provided for the use of the principal or the school.

Yet in a few moments the Senator having this bill in charge will oppose an amendment of mine seeking to strike from this bill the action of the committee in taking \$51,000 of the Indians' money with which to operate the agency in that section of the State.

At the time of my investigation it was necessary for me to hire a taxi on several occasions. The principal was using his own car, making the trip to Lawton several times a day for the mail and on other school matters. While attending services in Lawton, his car was stolen leaving him without a conveyance. He secured a truck from the Anadarko Agency which is now his only means of conveyance. I would recommend that one of the cars in storage at Anadarko, at the present time, be released for the use of this school, as it is often necessary to transport students from the school to the hospital during the night and the home conditions should be studied by the principal, necessitating the use of a Government car.

TYPEWRITERS

There is only one typewriter at this school which is located in a room adjoining the cottage in which the principal resides.

A great Government institution with only one old, dilapidated typewriter, and that located away off from the administration building.

A new typewriter should be furnished this school and the old one repaired and kept as a reserve, as it could be used in the school work. At the present time one is rented by the auditorium teacher at her own expense. There should be also a stenographer detailed to full-time office work in the principal's office. This is necessary if anything like order is expected from the files of this school.

PRINCIPAL'S COTTAGE

This cottage is an old building and in bad repair at the present time. The floors are in a bad condition. The rooms are small and the ceilings extremely high. One room of this cottage is used as the principal's office. It contains two old desks, two old chairs, and a small bench for the typewriter. The filing system apparently has received little attention. The only telephone at the school is located in this room. Employees desiring to use the telephone must come to the office, and when there are telephone calls for employees, a great deal of the principal's time is taken in getting employees to the telephone.

There should be at least two more telephones located in convenient buildings at this school; in case of fire these are a necessity. The one phone is now located in an old frame building and at night is in a dark, isolated place.

This is something which will be of interest to the distinguished Senator from Utah, having the bill in charge:

HOME-ECONOMICS BUILDING

This building has only been completed recently and is unsuited for the purpose. It has a small reception room and large kitchen. The kitchen is used for classes and study hall and demonstration work, which makes a very unsatisfactory arrangement and detracts and interferes with the day's program. During the rain, the water runs down the walls of this building, discoloring them and causing a lot of damage. It also leaks through the ceiling in both rooms, and it is necessary to place pans and buckets on the floor under these places. Every time it rains, the rugs have to be taken up and stored away. I called Superintendent Buntin's attention to this condition after I had witnessed it on two different occasions. This department is badly neglected, having only one sewing machine and not being furnished the necessary material.

TRUCK FOR SCHOOL

The school is very much in need of a large truck for heavy hauling and transporting students to and from the city of Lawton,

and could be used in transporting the children to the ball games in which the school takes part over this section of the country.

They have a thousand acres there of fine upland, fine bottom land, and just across the road is the United States experiment station. That land could be used admirably for the school. There is a hospital located on the grounds. Yet the bureau, with 1,600 children out of school, is unwilling even to consider the enlargement of the institution.

TRACTOR

The land surrounding the school should be utilized for farming purposes and to educate the older boys that desire to take up agriculture. During the past summer there was no pasture for the dairy herds and a scarcity of feed and I was informed by Superintendent Buntin, also Mr. Smith, the principal of this school, that no fall pasture would have been provided had they not borrowed a tractor from a neighbor who was kind enough to lend it to the school when the ground was so hard and dry it was impossible to plow with teams.

Between fifty and sixty acres of ground were plowed late this fall and sown into wheat which is now providing pasture for the dairy herd. Superintendent Buntin explained the lack of attention to the matters by the man in charge being replaced with a competent agricultural man.

I am still reading from the report of the Government upon its own institutions. Here is what the Government said:

Under Exhibit A, you will find a statement from the dairyman. This statement was made after I inspected the dairy herd; also a herd of beef cattle that had been maintained at this school for several years. The dairy herd showed every evidence of the lack of food. The cows were thin. This was also true of the herd of beef cattle, which were in poor flesh and not in a salable condition other than for canning purposes.

The United States Government starving its own cows and beef cattle to death!

With the number of acres of fertile land surrounding this school, I am at loss to understand why a condition of this kind was allowed to exist.

We have been unable to understand that for years. The officials who pass upon the matter never have been there; they will not even believe their own agents' reports. The condition of these helpless people is getting worse and worse from year to year and from day to day.

Superintendent Buntin in his testimony advises he has issued orders and the beef herd will be sold.

When this beef herd gets so poor that it can not be sold upon the market, when there is no feed for the animals, then the United States Government is selling the herd for canning purposes—an evidence of the management and generosity of the guardian toward its helpless wards—and yet when I offer an amendment recommended by the superintendent of the local agency, recommended by the Department of the Interior, because it has no estimate from the Budget the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] feels called upon to submit a point of order, when on yesterday this body voted \$30,000,000 with only a few moments of debate to put some blisters on some old secondhand battle-ships which, when they are repaired, will be worthless.

Here is something interesting:

DINING ROOM AND KITCHEN

An inspection of the kitchen, while it was clean and apparently in charge of competent cooks, was filled with flies. The screens on the kitchen windows and doors were in bad repair and some missing. The dining room is clean, well-lighted, and the tables have sanitary tops. New dishes should be furnished. Glass fruit jars were being used as containers for milk, coffee, etc.; no pitchers are provided.

The United States Government, with billions of wealth, the guardian of these defenseless people, requires the children at the Indian schools to drink their coffee and their milk out of used fruit jars! No pitchers are provided.

The tables presented a very crude appearance, the children calling our attention to the odd assortment of dishes in use.

FENCING

Part of the fencing around the farm and grazing land, also the cross fences are in need of repair. A great deal of the employee's time is spent in returning cattle to the schools that escape on account of this condition. The conditions at this school are such that practically every employee that I interviewed was disheartened and discouraged in attempting to make the proper showing. The principal at this school was recently transferred from New Mexico and has been in the service many years. Since arriving at Fort

Sill he has improved the drives by filling in with gravel. However, the greater part of the driveways are in the most deplorable condition.

During my stay at Fort Sill I was visited by many of the Indians from the reservations, and they feel that the Fort Sill School has been neglected to the extent that the young Indian boys and girls belonging to the several tribes are not progressing as well as those at other Government schools that have better facilities.

The entire plant impressed me as having been neglected for a number of years, and I am of the opinion that, while Superintendent Buntin is a very capable man, this school has suffered by neglect and on account of him having such a large territory—more than any one man can properly supervise. The unit at Fort Sill, in my opinion, should be under the management of the principal in charge, who should be held responsible for the care of the buildings and the proper cultivation of the farm lands.

CHARLES J. SMITH,
Inspector Interior Department.

Mr. President, if the Congress can not hear from the Budget Bureau, if the Congress can not have the recommendation of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, what are these wards of the Government to expect? They can not be heard through their Congressmen; they can not be heard through their Senators, excepting out of order. I am taking the time of the Senate now to acquaint the Congress, to leave a record at least of the true conditions as they exist in some parts wherein these Indians live.

Recently the Committee on Indian Affairs sent a subcommittee to Oklahoma. That subcommittee spent 12 days traveling, day and night, and holding hearings. The committee visited practically every reservation, visited many of the schools of the State, and at this particular school to which I have referred (the Fort Sill School) we held our hearing in the auditorium—one little room, formerly a classroom, holding perhaps 75 people, at one end a little elevation called a stage. There, in the so-called auditorium, the committee met, and before the committee there appeared one of the original blanket Indians of the Kiowa and Comanche Tribes, educated at this little school, who went there 10 years and got to the second grade—not because he was unable to make more progress but because that is the highest grade they had at that time. This Comanche Indian stood before us. He had on a flannel shirt, khaki trousers, and the brogan shoes common to the Indian tribe. His hair was long, parted in the middle, plaited down his back. He made a speech to our committee, and at this time I desire to call the attention of the Senate to that speech. I read from the original notes given me by the stenographer who took down the speech. This Indian was making a plea for his people. He was making a plea for his own children. I read:

SURVEY OF CONDITIONS OF THE INDIANS IN THE UNITED STATES

(United States Senate, subcommittee of the Committee on Indian Affairs, Fort Sill Indian School, Lawton, Okla., Saturday, November 22, 1930)

The subcommittee met pursuant to agreement, the Hon. LYNN J. FRAZIER (chairman) presiding, at 9 o'clock a. m.

Present: Senators PINE and THOMAS.

Albert Attocknie was called as a witness, and after being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

Senator FRAZIER. You may proceed.

Mr. ATTOCKNIE. Honorable Senate committee, the Great White Father in Washington has seen fit to hear the pleas of my people down here, the restricted Indians of the Comanche Tribe. We are here assembled this morning, as we have been in the past from time to time, as our Senators from Oklahoma, Senators PINE and THOMAS, can recall.

We have been asking that the Fort Sill Indian School be enlarged to a capacity of about 600. We have children located around here in the immediate vicinity from the various tribes that will fill the school very readily. We have passed resolutions that Senators THOMAS and PINE already have received. We firmly believe that is the only way of assimilating the Indian from his native life of living in a tepee into the palefaces' civilization. We have people here who are now my age who have attended school here. There are children of those former students, and also grandchildren, that are now attending the Fort Sill Indian School. Some of them have to have interpreters to transact business or to enable them to talk.

We are asking that this committee inquire and ask the speakers at the Federal building whether or not they are able to send their children to the public schools decently clothed and properly fed like the white people who send their children to those schools. I say no. We are not in that stage of life yet. We need the Government boarding schools, I say, all over the United States yet for a period of say, 50 years. There is no use of the investigating

committee educating me. I am too old. These other older people here, there is no use trying to educate them or anything else because they will die just as they are.

When we are not advanced to the stage where we can compete with the white population of the United States just like white men, the Indians refer to that and say the children are not raised right; they are not shown right. We hear that they are the criminals; they are the failures of the community where they reside. It is natural, therefore, to blame the other fellow for what your faults may be and to say that the United States Government did not properly school us. I believe I am as intelligent as my children who are going to school. I have one in the ninth grade and one in the sixth, the youngest one only at the age of 9. I went to school several years—10 years maybe. I got to the second grade. Am I to blame for that? I believe I have the brains just the same as these children have in the higher grades.

We are here asking that the Fort Sill School be retained, where our children may be trained to take their part as successful citizens in the United States for a long period of time in the future. I disagree with Secretary Wilbur. I say when Secretary Wilbur says, "We will win the Indians in 20 years," he is mistaken. I would like to ask the Secretary to take one day to go through the reservation where the actual suffering may be seen, where our children may be seen going barefooted because they have no money to buy shoes. Of course, this year was an especially hard time. The depression has been prevalent all over the United States and especially among the Indians.

It has not been such a long time ago since we lived in tepees and had never been in a building like this. I was born on a reservation in a tepee and so were many of these older parents. We did not know anything about hospitals; we did not know anything about schools. We were afraid to go to schools because they said, "the white man will mistreat you and you will die with tuberculosis if you attend the white man's school." Well; it was really so, because I believe the health department of the Indian Bureau did not look after the students well enough. Another thing is they take them to a different climate and the climatic conditions of Pennsylvania and Haskell have not been suitable to our people. I sent three students to Haskell from the Fort Sill Indian School. One of them came back with his lungs affected. The other two have passed through Haskell and have diplomas, they tell me. I do not know what "diploma" means. I do not know what it means to have an education. A teacher in the Government service has to have a diploma from other schools. These two children of mine have finished Haskell but they tell me they can not teach in the white public schools because they do not have the proper education.

Now, I believe the Indian schools here should be advanced. Haskell should be advanced. They should be given there a full course of a college nature and, speaking for my people here, the restricted Indian, I say that Fort Sill ought to be increased to where it will take at least 600 pupils. I believe we have enough pupils around here so that we could take that many children. Many children have graduated from this school. Senator THOMAS will recall he was here one time when we lined up 24 young people such as you have seen here, who were graduating from the Fort Sill Indian School. They stayed here and got their diplomas and graduated from this school, but I do not believe half of them have gone on for further education.

Now, a Comanche Indian thinks just as much of his child as any other father of his offspring. It is just like a cow with her little calf. You take the calf away from her and put it into an adjoining field, even though the calf is being well cared for, yet it is natural for that cow, or horse too, to try to break over sometimes. Horses will cut themselves in order to get to their offspring. We are just like the animals I referred to when you send our students from here over to Haskell. The natural inclination is that they want to go home. I do not know whether any of you Senators have been away from home when you were a boy or not, but I can recall when I went to school. I wanted to go back to my tepee and be with my own people. I had better food; I was better clothed; I was in a better home; but I must go back. That, to some extent, keeps the child from learning I believe. I do not know for certain but that is what I believe. If the student is satisfied, why they can learn more. So we plead for a bigger school right here at Fort Sill.

We need two dormitories; we need an administration building; we need shop buildings; we are the most needful of any institution in the Indian Service.

When our children grow up the larger boys could be trained as harnessmakers, they could be trained as mechanics, they could be trained as shoemakers, or as carpenters, and, in many other things, if you had the facilities here at the Fort Sill Indian School to do so. I believe I am expressing, when I say that, the sentiment of the restricted class of Indians here, those like myself who have no education. Some of them are worse than I am. I can talk broken English. I am able to talk to you now but some of them can not even do that. Our time is so limited. We are asking that our case be considered. We have talked to the superintendent and asked him to recommend to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs these things. We have appealed to Senators PINE and THOMAS to introduce a bill in Congress in order that we may have bigger schools. For some reason we do not have any success. I am inclined to believe, if you people will question the Indians as to their home conditions, and so forth, that you will disagree with Secretary Wilbur that we are far advanced as some reports have indicated.

We are expressing the desire of the Comanches situated in Comanche County that this Fort Sill School be made larger. The hope of the Indian race is in their youth, which you see back there.

That is something, Mr. President, that some others, including Senators upon this floor, have not as yet discovered. This untutored Comanche Indian makes the statement that the hope of the Indian race is in their youth.

Educate them and in due course of time we will get to where Secretary Wilbur may say we have won the Indians. That is a long way off, Mr. Senators. We are just in the dawn of time so far as that is concerned. We have all afternoon to get there yet. The white man did not attain his citizenship and his success in the course of one generation. No. They must have taken many generations.

Mr. President, I suggest that a copy of this speech, delivered by this untutored Comanche Indian, a wild Comanche Indian with long hair plaited down his back, be sent to the distinguished Commissioner of Indian Affairs, with the request that he answer it. I suggest that another copy be sent to the distinguished Secretary of the Interior, and likewise that he be asked to submit a reply thereto.

Mr. President, the amendment that is now pending before the Senate proposes to transfer the source of funds for the maintenance of the Kiowa Agency from the tribal funds of the Indians to the Federal Treasury. For years past the Government has been using money belonging to these Indians with which to support an Indian agency that not only supervises these particular Indians but supervises other tribes of Indians. In other words, money taken from A, B, and C is used by the Government for supervising the business of D, E, and F.

We hear it said sometimes, Mr. President, that the white man has robbed the Indians. I make the statement here now that for every dollar that the white people of America have robbed the Indians the Government has robbed them of a thousand, and here in this amendment another act of robbery is on its way.

Mr. President, I do not desire to be too severe upon the chairman of the subcommittee, but he does not know what this item means; the committee does not know what it means; the Senate does not know what it means; and neither does any Member of the House of Representatives know what it means. I am complaining of the system that has grown up with reference to the conduct of Indian affairs. Clerks of the Indian Office come to Congress and submit a budget estimate and Congress accepts that budget and proceeds to enact its terms into law without knowing anything of what it is doing.

I said a moment ago that this item proposes to take money from the remnants of trust funds belonging to these three tribes of Indians and to use that money to support in part an Indian agency that has under its jurisdiction other tribes than the ones proposed to be taxed to maintain that agency. Against that item and that practice I protest.

I now submit for the RECORD, and ask the clerk to read in my time, a letter from the business committee of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

ANADARKO, OKLA., December 13, 1930.

HON. ELMER THOMAS,

Member of the United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: We, the Kiowa tribal business committee, have noted an item in the paper where it is proposed to appropriate \$51,000 of our Red River oil money to be used in paying the running expenses of the Kiowa Agency.

As representatives of our tribe, we strongly protest against this fund being used to pay current expenses which should be paid by an appropriation from the General Treasury funds.

We know that you are familiar with the facts in the case, as you told us last year you would use your influence in the future to prevent our tribal money from being used to pay the running expenses of the Indian agency. In our interview with you, you advised us that Senator JONES promised you that if you would permit the 1930 appropriation to be made from our Red River oil fund that he would see that the funds were not again used to pay expenses of the Indian agency.

Trusting you will use your influence in our behalf to prevent our Red River funds from being used to pay the expenses of the agency, and with best wishes, we are,

Respectfully,

NED E. BRACE,
DELOS K. LONEWOLF,
JASPER SAUNKEAH,
Committeemen.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, supporting that petition and protest, I submit a similar petition and protest signed liberally by the members of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians, and ask that it be made a part of the RECORD, but not read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VANDENBERG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

PETITION OF KIOWA, COMANCHE, AND APACHE INDIANS, PROTESTING APPROPRIATIONS OF "RED RIVER MONEY" FOR MAINTENANCE OF KIOWA INDIAN AGENCY, ANADARKO, OKLA.

We, the undersigned members of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians, do hereby protest the appropriation of \$60,000 for the maintenance of the Kiowa Indian Agency, Anadarko, Okla., from our tribal fund, known as the Red River fund.

The maintenance of the Kiowa Indian Agency, in all justice to our people, as made up of the three tribes above mentioned, should be paid out of a general appropriation for the reason that the business interest of only the original allottees and landowners of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians is supervised and administered by the Kiowa Indian Agency. The business interests of the allottees and landowners of the Wichita, Caddo Tribes, and affiliated bands of Indians, who have no interest in our fund whatsoever, is also supervised and administered by the Kiowa Indian Agency. The Government is virtually taking money out of the pockets of the minors and unallotted of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians, who have no income other than what is derived from the annuity payments from the "Red River fund," to apply on a function that benefits other Indians and in which they have no interest.

NED E. BRACE, *Chairman,*
MAXIE FRIZZLEHEAD,
LEWIS G. WARE,
Tribal Business Committeemen.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the item to which the amendment goes proposes to take the sum of \$51,000, the remnant of the trust fund of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians, over their protest, and to use such fund for the maintenance of the Anadarko Agency, a general Indian agency having supervision over other tribes of Indians who contribute nothing to such expense. The Anadarko Agency has supervision over some 10 tribes and remnants of tribes, embracing some 5,500 Indians. The Kiowas, Comanches, and Apaches, three tribes of this group, embracing some 4,000 members, have the remnants of trust funds approximating some \$300,000. The other tribes have no trust funds. Approximately one-half, or 2,000, of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians have practically no property save their interest in this rapidly diminishing trust fund.

Here is the situation: Four thousand Indians; 2,000 of them have no land. They have their proportional part of the interest in a trust fund of \$300,000, which means that these Indians have to-day no property in the world save an interest amounting to \$58 per capita; and the Indian Bureau, over their protest, is proposing to take this remnant to support a general Indian agency. When this money is gone these Indians have no land. They have no allotments. They have no money. They become unrestricted. The moment that they do, the practice of the Government is to turn them adrift; and to-day Indians in similar situations can not even go and get funds for medicine or hospital services from the Indian Bureau.

The bill as reported by the committee proposes to take the funds held by the Government, the guardian, in trust for old, indigent, incompetent, sick, insane, and minor propertyless Indians, and to use same for the benefit of the rich Indians or the Indians having lands to be leased and managed. Under the terms of the bill, over 2,000 Indians, without land or property, including children without allotments and aged Indians who have had patents forced upon them, and who in practically all such cases have been defrauded out of their lands, will be charged some \$12.50 per person

to maintain a general Indian agency for other tribes who have funds and property but no trust funds.

These Indians who have no lands have a \$58 interest in a trust fund. They are old. Some are sick. Some are insane. Some are blind. Others are minor children, with only \$58 in the world; and the chairman of this committee proposes to take their money to support a general Indian agency having supervision over other Indians than those mentioned.

I have heard of people taking money from the blind, from the insane, and the sick; but I know of no case where the guardian has done that in the case of his ward. Perhaps they have; but here the great United States of America, worth its hundreds of billions of dollars, now is proposing, by the strong right arm of force, to reach its hands into the pockets of these poor Indians, with only \$58 between them and starvation, and take their money to support an agency. I will refer briefly in a moment to the nature of the support this agency gives them.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. If a guardian appointed by a court to look after the welfare of a ward, a minor, should do or undertake to do what is indicated here, the court would probably remove that guardian.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The court should not stop there. The guardian should be placed in the penitentiary.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I was about to add that the court probably would send him to jail also.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am not blaming the committee. They know not what they do.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. But they ought to know.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I make no apology for them.

Mr. President, these propertyless Indians receive practically no benefits from the agency they are taxed to maintain, save the services rendered in the payment to them of the sum of \$25 twice a year. During recent years there has been some money in their funds, and they have had a per capita payment of \$50 a year. That is paid to these Indians in two payments, in the fall and spring. This Indian agency pays these Indians two checks for \$25 each, and for that service the Government charges these Indians \$12.50. It imposes a 25 per cent tax upon these defenseless people to collect their own money.

Evidence taken recently by the Indian subcommittee shows that 90 per cent of the work of the Indian agencies is devoted to the rich Indians or the Indians having property, and that the Indians without property, when known, receive no attention from the agencies or from the Bureau of Indian Affairs here at Washington.

I said a few days ago that the agency at Washington, the Indian Bureau, has made a distinction in its definition of an Indian. If an American citizen has a drop of Indian blood in his veins and a dollar of restricted money, he is an Indian; but if he is a full blood and has not a restricted dollar, he is not an Indian. That full-blooded Indian, without a dollar, can not to-day go to the Indian Bureau and get a dollar with which to maintain himself and his family from starvation. He can not even go and get medicine; and the only medicine they furnish in many places, as I said the other day, is some pills and castor oil, and they can not even furnish that to an unrestricted Indian.

Not so very long ago an Indian having every mark of the original aborigine became ill. He entered an Indian Government hospital, stayed a few days, and the Indian Bureau found that he was not a restricted Indian, that he had no money. He was compelled to leave a sick bed, and did leave a sick bed. Why, the policy of the Indian Bureau is such that if an Indian came along sick, and if the department gave him a pill or a dose of castor oil, and thereafter it should be discovered that he was not a restricted Indian, they would use a stomach pump upon that Indian to retrieve the medicine thus given to him.

The policy of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is such that when an Indian is given his patent, and becomes an unre-

stricted Indian, he thereby ceases to be an Indian; and what happens to him thereafter is of little, if any, concern of the department.

As fresh evidence of this policy I call your attention to a message just received from the superintendent of the agency of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma.

On January 2 I sent the superintendent a message as follows:

Please advise me by wire collect if it is necessary for the Government to provide funds for the relief of Indians under your jurisdiction; and if so, indicate nature and extent of relief necessary.

On January 3 I received the following reply:

Answering telegram, probably 500 families restricted Indians will need aid from Government for groceries, medical attention, clothing, until May 1. Red Cross can possibly estimate unrestricted Indians needing aid.

There is a concrete illustration that the bureau have no funds for the unrestricted Indians, although they may be full bloods. They have not a dollar for them; and here the committee is reporting a bill to make 2,000 Comanche Indians propertyless in the next 12 months. I am pleading to postpone that evil day for at least a year; and if my amendment is adopted it will be postponed then only for a year.

Under existing policies only Indians who have property under restriction are considered as Indians, and all others, even those whose property has been dissipated and squandered by the department itself, are outcasts and turned adrift to wander, to drift, and to die.

When the Senate subcommittee was in my State in November testimony was received to the effect that at that time Indians were actually and literally starving to death.

On yesterday I received a letter from a minister in eastern Oklahoma. He said that in the past 10 days five Cherokee Indians have died of starvation.

Under present policies any citizen of Indian descent, with only a few drops of Indian blood coursing through his veins and with a restricted dollar, is considered an Indian; but another Indian, although a full blood and without a restricted dollar, is not an Indian, is beyond the jurisdiction of the department and beneath the notice of the agents of the Indian Service.

Mr. President, the policy of the Indian Bureau in selling the allotments of Indians and using the proceeds in building gaudy houses which are seldom used and, for the want of maintenance and repair, soon are uninhabitable, and the policy of taking by force the last few dollars of the indigent, homeless, and helpless members of the Kiowa jurisdiction, as is now in the bill before us proposed to be done, hastens the day when these Indians, those who now have land, will be paupers and those who have an interest in the almost-depleted trust fund will be penniless; and when that evil day shall arrive—in the language of the Indians, only a few sleeps ahead—these American citizens, once the owners of the vast plains of the Central West, will have only the Red Cross between them and dissolution.

Mr. President, I can not support such a policy toward the wards of the Government of the United States. If the item now being attacked were the mere sum of \$51,000, I would not feel justified in using valuable time in attempting to lay before the Senate and the country the administrative policy of one of the bureaus of the Government. But, Mr. President, this is not merely an item of \$51,000. It is an item synonymous with a policy—the policy of a guardian toward his ward and the policy of the Government of the United States toward the American Indian.

As a policy the amount of money involved is of no concern. The importance of the issue raised transcends the possible value of money and can be measured only by the future welfare and even by the lives of thousands of Indian citizens of the United States.

Mr. President, I oppose the appropriation of \$51,000 of the trust funds of these Indians, not alone because it robs by law over 2,000 landless and defenseless people but because it is a wrong, unjust, and defenseless policy for the

Government to follow in the exercise of the responsibilities of guardianship toward its Indian wards.

While the questioned item is here upon the presumed recommendation of the responsible head of the Indian Office, yet it is doubted if he ever heard of the 4 per cent fund or the Red River oil fund, or even could name the several tribes under the jurisdiction of the Kiowa Agency. Admittedly he has never visited these children of his care, and has not even visited the State embracing over one-half his wards, and presenting every possible problem confronting the bureau under his supervision.

At this point I ask to be permitted to call attention to a circular outlining the kind of services these identical Indians receive at the hands of the very employees whose salaries they are compelled to pay.

I exhibit a mimeographed sheet headed "Circular to Indians," issued at the Kiowa Indian Agency, Anadarko, Okla., April 15, 1930, and signed by the district superintendent in charge.

Remember, these Indians are forced to pay the expenses of the employees who operate the agency, and the agency in turn gets out a circular telling the Indians what kind of services they can have for their own money.

From this circular I read the following:

Friday of each week has been set apart as a day for Indians to transact such business at the agency office as can not be transacted through their farmers and other field employees.

The circular tells these Indians, "Although you pay me my salary, yet you can not come and see me except on one day per week, and that day is Friday."

Again I read:

Since Friday is set apart as a day for the Indians to take care of their miscellaneous business they are not to come to the office requesting checks or information which will cause the clerks to devote their time to this class of work and fail to get such important work as the drawing of and mailing out of checks, done on time.

And again:

Indians are requested, therefore, not to call at the agency office during the first four work days of the week for the miscellaneous information which they desire that can not be furnished by the farmers on their office days, but wait until Friday, when routine office work will be laid aside and their business handled.

Mr. President, to-day is Saturday, and on this very day and at this very hour there are hundreds of Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians, old and young, sick and insane, cold and hungry, who are, by their guardian—the Congress of the United States—proposed to be taxed to maintain an agency to which they to-day can not even gain admission.

Under the orders contained in this circular the Indians can not call upon or see their local farmer on but two days per week. They pay the salaries of these commissioners, yet they can see them only on two days per week. The circular says:

The office days of each farmer will be Friday and Saturday of each week. Submit your requests and purchase orders through your farmer.

The last pathetic paragraph is as follows:

In conclusion permit me to insist that you cooperate with this office in the handling of your business as far as practicable through the farmers and other field officers near your homes. By so doing you will avoid the expense and loss of time in making needless trips to the agency, and you will have time at home to look after your poultry, gardens, stock, and be more able to meet your obligations and take care of yourself and families.

They are told that if they come on other days than Friday, it will be a useless trip; that they can not see their own employees, whom they are forcibly taxed to maintain.

Mr. President, if I am correctly advised, more than half of these three tribes have no lands, have no poultry, have no gardens, and have no stock. All their worldly goods consist of the few remaining dollars in this trust fund, less than \$60 per capita, if this appropriation shall prevail.

This item in its present form should not be in this bill. The policy which the item exemplifies is wrong. The

Indians have protested against this policy, but without success. I have protested to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but my protests have gone unnoticed. Perhaps I should not expect so much from those who presume to shape the destiny and to control the property of the Indian wards of the Government of the United States.

The Congress is presumed to make the policies for the education and civilization of the Indian citizens of the country. By the act of June 2, 1924, all Indians born in the United States were declared to be citizens of the United States.

Over a period of years, through lack of interest and for the want of sympathy for a helpless race, the Congress has delegated the responsibility of making our Indian policy to the Secretary of the Interior. For the same reason that the Congress has shifted the burden, the Secretary of the Interior has delegated the Indian policy making to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and there the responsibility rests to-day. But the fault which I assert is not at the door of the Indian Office alone. It rests, mountainlike, on the very steps of the Capitol of the United States.

These developed and developing policies have been and are being formed right here by the Congress itself. The status of the Indian citizen to-day is the result of policies suggested by the Indian Office, rubber stamped by the Congress, approved by the President, and placed into effect under rules and regulations made and promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. President, I assert that the direct and unescapable responsibility rests upon the Congress to shape and make the policies for the benefit of our Indian wards, and then it is the further duty of the Congress to see that such formulated policies are fairly, justly, and fully carried out by the agents of the Government commissioned to execute the laws enacted by the only lawmaking department of the Government.

In the last analysis, all sustained inefficiency, incompetence, and maladministration of every form in every branch of the public service finds its support and nutriment in the two Houses forming the Congress of the United States.

If the item to which I have alluded and which my amendment seeks to strike from the bill is by the votes of the Senate retained in the measure, one more injustice will have been done to three Indian tribes embracing some 4,000 Indian wards of our Government.

Injustice has been done these wards before. Former bills have authorized the Interior Department to reach its hands into the sacred trust fund of these Indians and to take therefrom a total sum of over one-half million dollars, and to use such funds for the maintenance of a general agency for other tribes and for the maintenance of a general hospital for the care and benefit of Indians from all parts of the United States.

I oppose such a policy, and I protest this unconscionable misappropriation of the trust funds of the helpless and defenseless wards of the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, the Indians have never been able to learn and do not now know how their trust funds have been managed and expended. No accounting is made or statements rendered to the business committees representing the various Indian tribes. Likewise, no statements are made to the individual Indians who have funds retained under the jurisdiction of the local agencies, or even by the Indian Office itself.

For years the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians did not know that their trust funds were being used to maintain a general agency and a general hospital under the Anadarko jurisdiction. They by chance made the discovery. Forthwith they filed a protest, and such protest has been continuous since that discovery.

In addition to their protest to the department and to the respective Houses of the Congress, I have likewise protested in this Chamber. Two Congresses ago I presented an amendment similar to the one now before us, and it was agreed by the Senate. In the conference committee, that graveyard of Senate hopes, plans, and amendments, it was

quietly entombed among its many brothers. In the succeeding Congress I resurrected the amendment and proposed it in the Senate Committee on Appropriations. That was last year. The amendment was not accepted by the committee, and I notified the Senator in charge of the bill, now the distinguished chairman of the great and powerful Committee on Appropriations, that I proposed to offer it in the Senate, whereupon the distinguished Senator stated that if I would not propose the amendment and would call his attention to the item in the next bill he would try to help work out a solution.

Acting upon what I construed to be a promise of assistance, I did not at that time offer the amendment, and when the pending bill reached the Senate I went before the subcommittee to which it was referred and renewed my opposition to the item and submitted a motion to strike it from the bill. When the bill was reported to the Senate the objectionable item, like Banquo's ghost, appeared in its accustomed place, and again I am forced to occupy the time of the Senate in performing what I conceive to be my unescapable and imperative duty—the task of trying to prevent the Government of the United States from taking by force the trust funds of landless and homeless old men and women, of the sick and insane, and of minors and incompetents for the purpose of paying salaries and expenses, buying automobiles and supplies, and the general maintenance expenses of an Indian agency which donates much of its time to Indian wards other than members of the tribes thus forcibly taxed to maintain such agency.

Mr. President, the use of such funds for the purposes mentioned, while made legal by law, nevertheless constitutes, in my judgment, a misappropriation of trust funds, and when known will be condemned as a crime against not only our helpless Indian wards but likewise a crime against the public conscience of America.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. What is the origin of the trust fund?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is an interesting question. The committee does not know, the chairman does not know, the House does not know; but one man in the Department of the Interior knows, and that one man not only governs this Congress but 300,000 Indians located throughout the United States. We are his mere rubber stamps; acting, I might say, ignorantly; I know of no milder word to correctly express the idea I have in my mind.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. The Senator understands I am seeking information.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I will explain.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. What is the origin of the trust fund? Who, then, are the beneficiaries, and what right has anybody to divert the fund from the purpose for which it is designed?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. These three tribes of Indians 300 years ago roamed over the plains of America in the central West, from the Dakotas to the Gulf, from the Mississippi to the Rockies. They were in undisputed possession of such lands in that area as they desired.

Along about 1865 the Government, desiring their lands, invited them to participate in a convention at Medicine Lodge, Kans. At that time these Indians were in unrestricted possession of all this territory. The Government invited the Indians to come and listen to a proposition to be made to them, and at that time a proposition was made to them, a threat, a demand, that the Indians restrict their plain possessions to territory embracing the larger part of Oklahoma and the northwestern part of Texas. They had to accede to the demands made by the Government. They acceded to the treaty in 1865, but a few years afterwards the Government found that it held title to no land in Texas. Texas always owned her land. So the Government had made a treaty giving these Indians land in Texas over which it had no color of title. Therefore they had to get the In-

dians together again, and they proposed to them that they deed their lands in Texas and take a smaller reservation.

Again the Indians were summoned into a camp at Medicine Lodge, Kans. On a river up there in western Kansas where it is shady, surrounded by high hills, these Indians were assembled in a valley. On the high hills overlooking this valley were stationed 500 artillerymen with cannon and a thousand cavalymen. There in the valley in the shade, surrounded by cannon and 1,500 soldiers, they made their new treaty, and I will refer to it later.

The Indians in effect were told this, "Unless you cede this land and take this smaller reservation, we will go to war on you. You can have your choice of fighting or moving"; and they chose to move. I will refer to that later in the words of the Indians themselves.

Later on, when the Indians were forced into the smaller reservation, upon land to which the Government claimed to have title, they were getting along all right for years, but along about 1896 the white man began to want the lands in the smaller reservation, and the Government again made a treaty with the Indians proposing to buy the land, and it did buy it, reserving in it four different tracts called "pastures," and gave the Indians \$4,000,000 for it.

From 1901 until the present time that money has been used in per capita payments to the Indians. That money is gone. The Indians had reserved some smaller areas, and later on they were sold under the orders of the Government; that is, they agreed to what the Government said. That land was sold, and the money was spent by the Government.

In 1923 the Indians themselves discovered that they had an equitable claim to the south half of the Red River. In the early days the middle of the Red River was thought to be the boundary line between Oklahoma and Texas. Texas laid claim to the south half, but when oil was discovered there Oklahoma laid claim to it and the Federal Government laid claim to it. The matter went to the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court finally held that the boundary line did not stop at the river but went to the south bank of the Red River, placing the land in Oklahoma, placing the southern boundary line at the south bank of the Red River, but in making the original treaty the middle of the river was written in the treaty as the boundary line. The Indians got the idea, and it was their own discovery, that their reservation should have gone to the Texas boundary line; that when that treaty was originally made it was the intention of the Government to give them all the land in that particular territory that the Government had had. If the Government had known at that time that the boundary line went to the south bank of the Red River, it was the contention of the Indians that they would have been given title to that land within their reservation. Upon the discovery of oil there the Indians laid claim to royalties from the oil discovered on the south bank of the Red River.

I came to Congress in 1923. My first act was to introduce a bill giving them the benefit of these royalties. The Indians went into their own pockets to raise money, hired private attorneys, and brought witnesses to Washington. They brought back to Washington the former Chief of Staff, Hugh L. Scott, who had served on that Indian reservation in the earlier days. They brought here ex-Governor Taylor, of Tennessee, who, as a young man, when his father was Indian Commissioner in 1867, had gone to Medicine Lodge and was there present at the time the treaty was made.

After three years of argument and expense on the part of the Indians themselves, over the protest of the Government, over the protest of the Department of Justice, with no support from the Department of the Interior or the Indian Bureau, they won their case. They convinced the great Public Lands Committee of the House that they were right and the House passed a bill giving the Indians the royalties. They amounted to about \$1,500,000. The bill came to the Senate. Former Senator Harrell, of Oklahoma, was then chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs. His sympathies were with the Indians and he got the Senate to pass

the bill. From that source, from their own private resources, their own ingenuity, they discovered their right, prosecuted the right, and every dollar they have now is in the Indian Office as a result of their own efforts. There is no case on record where money of this kind has been used by the Government to maintain an agency or a hospital or a school even for the Indians themselves.

Mr. President, I have dwelt at some length on what the Congress proposes to do. I wish to invite the attention of the Senate briefly, if I may, to one other feature of the proposition. The courts have always been friendly to the Indians. The Congress, when it understands the matter, has always been friendly to the Indians. I know of no injustice ever done to the Indians when the Congress understood what it was doing. But the Indians have had no one here in the past that had any friendly interest in their case. I am doing the best I can, with such support as I have, which is most valuable.

Here is what the Indian Bureau has had to say about these Indians.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Then, to sum up the situation, the fund thus raised and created was committed to the care of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It was.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. The legal, the equitable title to it rests in these particular Indians?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. It was supposed to be used for their benefit?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. On the basis of per capita payment, always, as in other similar cases.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. As I understand the situation, it is proposed to divert that fund and devote it to some other purpose than that to which it was originally devoted?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Exactly so; and it has been diverted in the past to the extent of half a million dollars that the Indians do not now have. It would take a Philadelphia lawyer to understand the situation. This particular item is not understood. The Senate does not understand it. The Senator from Utah in charge of the bill does not understand it or he would not take the position he does about the item.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. As the Senator explains it, it appears to me to be a very simple matter, namely, that we ought not to violate the arrangement in respect of this trust fund. It seems to me that is the very point involved in the discussion.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator has come to the only conclusion anyone can reach if he has any sympathy for a race that can not speak or act for themselves.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the only record before the Senate from the Indian office. Here is what Mr. Dodd said. He is the man to whom I referred a while ago as being the dictator down there. He has charge of the finances. Some one has to do it. He does it well, but I object to an employee of the Indian Office dictating these affairs without the matter being understood and approved by those responsible. He is not responsible. He is working for the Indian Office. He is working for the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. He is not employed by the Indians. He feels no responsibility. The other day when I proposed in the committee to have reinstated in this very bill an item of \$160,000 to be made immediately available for the relief of the Indians, he said, "I oppose the item." I said, "Why?" He said, "If that item should pass, we would have to set up a net item on our books in the Indian Bureau." That is the only reason he gave for being opposed to it.

Here is what Mr. Dodd said about these Indians:

They have at this time, or had on June 30, \$737,000 in the Treasury, with the amounts appropriated for 1931 and 1932, totaling \$510,000, that will be available for future use after the 1932 fiscal year, \$237,000.

If this bill passes, these Indians, more than 4,000 of them, will have a trust fund remaining in the sum of \$237,000, or \$58 per capita, and that is all the money these Indians have. Half of them have no lands. When this money is gone, for the want of a dollar they become unrestricted. Then the Salvation Army and the Red Cross and the counties in which they live will constitute the only barrier between them and starvation.

Further on Mr. Dodd said:

Their income is about gone. They have no definite tribal assets from which they have any set income, and within two or three years' time the Congress will have to make an outright gratuity appropriation for the support of the activities at that point.

I have no hesitancy in making the statement that the policy in force to-day by the Government, acting through the Department of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, acting through the Congress, is to pauperize the American Indian, and when he is pauperized he will be set adrift to wander and to starve and to die, and this bill only hastens that evil day. I am protesting against it.

I have invited the attention of the Senate to the activities of the bureau and the attitude they maintain toward these Indians. I desire next to call the attention of the Senate to the action of about their only other friend, the courts of the country.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Certainly.

Mr. BLAINE. The Senator is describing a situation which exists in my own State. The facts are not identically the same, but there are several hundred Indians adrift. They are not on reservations in my State. These Indians have become poverty-stricken and have become charges upon the townships, charges to such an extent that the whites are finding it utterly impossible to raise sufficient cash to support the Indians for whom the Government of the United States ought to be responsible.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in the case of the *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (30 U. S.) Mr. Chief Justice Marshall, delivering the opinion of the court, said:

A people once numerous, powerful, and truly independent, found by our ancestors in the quiet and uncontrolled possession of an ample domain, gradually sinking beneath our superior policy, our arts and our arms, have yielded their lands by successive treaties, each of which contains a solemn guaranty of the residue, until they retain no more of their formerly extensive territory than is deemed necessary to their comfortable subsistence. To preserve this remnant, the present application is made.

In considering this subject, the habits and usages of the Indians, in their intercourse with their white neighbors, ought not to be entirely disregarded. At the time the Constitution was framed the idea of appealing to an American court of justice for an assertion of right or a redress of wrong had perhaps never entered the mind of an Indian or of his tribe. Their appeal was to the tomahawk or to the Government. This was well understood by the statesmen who framed the Constitution of the United States, and might furnish some reason for omitting to enumerate them among the parties who might sue in the courts of the Union. Be this as it may, the peculiar relations between the United States and the Indians occupying our territory are such that we should feel much difficulty in considering them as designated by the term "foreign state" were there no other part of the Constitution which might shed light on the meaning of these words. But we think that in construing them considerable aid is furnished by that clause in the eighth section of the third article; which empowers Congress to "regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

I am now reading from the opinion in the case of *United States v. Kagama* and *Another, Indians* (U. S. Repts. 118, 375):

The relation of the Indian tribes living within the borders of the United States, both before and since the Revolution, to the people of the United States has always been an anomalous one and of a complex character.

Following the policy of the European governments in the discovery of America toward the Indians who were found here, the Colonies before the Revolution and the States and the United States since, have recognized in the Indians a possessory right to the soil over which they roamed and hunted and established occasional villages. But they asserted an ultimate title in the land itself by which the Indian tribes were forbidden to sell or transfer it to other nations or peoples without the consent of this paramount authority. When a tribe wished to dispose of its land, or

any part of it, or the State or the United States wished to purchase it, a treaty with the tribe was the only mode in which this could be done. The United States recognized no right in private persons or in other nations to make such a purchase by treaty or otherwise. With the Indians themselves these relations are equally difficult to define. They were, and always have been, regarded as having a semi-independent position when they preserved their tribal relations; not as States, not as nations, not as possessed of the full attributes of sovereignty, but as a separate people, with the power of regulating their internal and social relations, and thus far not brought under the laws of the Union or of the State within whose limits they resided.

Perhaps the best statement of their position is found in the two opinions of this court by Chief Justice Marshall in the case of the *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (5 Pet. 1) and in the case of *Worcester v. State of Georgia* (6 Pet. 515, 536). These opinions are exhaustive, and in the separate opinion of Mr. Justice Baldwin, in the former, is a very valuable résumé of the treaties and statutes concerning the Indian tribes previous to and during the confederation.

In the first of the above cases it was held that these tribes were neither States nor nations, had only some of the attributes of sovereignty, and could not be so far recognized in that capacity as to sustain a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States. In the second case it was said that they were not subject to the jurisdiction asserted over them by the State of Georgia, which, because they were within its limits, where they had been for ages, had attempted to extend her laws and the jurisdiction of her courts over them.

In the opinions in these cases they are spoken of as "wards of the Nation," "pupils," as local dependent communities. In this spirit the United States has conducted its relations to them from its organization to this time. But, after an experience of 100 years of the treaty-making system of government, Congress has determined upon a new departure—to govern them by acts of Congress. This is seen in the act of March 3, 1871, embodied in paragraph 2079 of the Revised Statutes:

"No Indian nation or tribe, within the territory of the United States shall be acknowledged or recognized as an independent nation, tribe, or power, with whom the United States may contract by treaty; but no obligation of any treaty lawfully made and ratified with any such Indian nation or tribe prior to March 3, 1871, shall be hereby invalidated or impaired."

I read further from the opinion in *United States against Kagama* et al.:

It seems to us that this is within the competency of Congress. These Indian tribes are the wards of the Nation. They are communities dependent on the United States. Dependent largely for their daily food. Dependent for their political rights. They owe no allegiance to the States and receive from them no protection. Because of the local ill feeling, the people of the States where they are found are often their deadliest enemies. From their very weakness and helplessness, so largely due to the course of dealing of the Federal Government with them and the treaties in which it has been promised, there arises the duty of protection and with it the power. This has always been recognized by the Executive and by the Congress and by this court whenever the question has arisen.

In the case of *Worcester v. The State of Georgia*, above cited, it was held that though the Indians had by treaty sold their land within that State and agreed to remove away, which they had failed to do, the State could not while they remained on those lands extend its laws, criminal and civil, over the tribes; that the duty and power to compel their removal was in the United States, and the tribe was under their protection and could not be subjected to the laws of the State and the process of its courts.

The same thing was decided in the case of *Fellows v. Blacksmith et al.* (19 How. 366). In this case also the Indians had sold their lands, under supervision of the States of Massachusetts and of New York, and had agreed to remove within a given time. When the time came a suit to recover some of the land was brought in the Supreme Court of New York, which gave judgment for the plaintiff. But this court held, on writ of error, that the State could not enforce this removal, but the duty and the power to do so was in the United States. See also the case of the *Kansas Indians* (5 Wall. 737), *New York Indians* (5 Wall. 761).

The power of the General Government over these remnants of a race once powerful, now weak and diminished in numbers, is necessary to their protection—

I have shown how we are protecting them—

as well as to the safety of those among whom they dwell. It must exist in that Government, because it never has existed anywhere else, because the theater of its exercise is within the geographical limits of the United States, because it has never been denied, and because it alone can enforce its laws on all the tribes.

From the case of *Cramer et al. v. United States* (261 U. S. 332) I read:

In *United States v. Kagama* (118 U. S. 375, 383, 384) the general doctrine was laid down by this court that the Indian tribes are wards of the Nation—

The opinion does not say there that the rich Indians are the wards of the Nation; it does not say that the poor and

needy Indians are the wards of the Nation; but it says all Indian tribes are the wards of the Nation—

communities dependent on the United States. "From their very weakness and helplessness, so largely due to the course of dealing of the Federal Government with them and the treaties in which it has been promised, there arises the duty of protection and with it the power." This duty of protection and power extends to individual Indians, even though they may have become citizens.

I refer at this time to a decision delivered by the Supreme Court in 1886, in the case of the Kansas Indians, Fifth Wallace, 755:

Our superiority of strength and advantages of civilization should make us lenient toward the Indian. The wrong inflicted upon him should be taken into account and the balance placed to his credit. The moral view of the question should be considered and the question asked: Can not the Indian be made a useful and productive member of society by proper teaching and treatment? If the effort is made in good faith, we will stand better before the civilized nations of the earth and in our own conscience for having made it.

Reading again from the case of Cramer et al. against United States:

After pointing out the fact that it was the policy of the Government to protect all Indians and their property and to teach and persuade them to abandon their nomadic habits the court said: "The civil and political status of the Indians does not condition the power of the Government to protect their property or to instruct them. Their admission to citizenship does not deprive the United States of its power nor relieve it of its duty."

Mr. President, so much for the decisions of the Supreme Court. Without exception the Supreme Court has been friendly to the Indians; without exception the Supreme Court has known what it was doing; and every tribunal that knows what it is doing, that is responsible, has been friendly toward the Indians. Those who do not know and make no effort to find out, I fear, have sometimes acted otherwise.

I now desire to call the attention of the Senate to the opinions and policy of some of the former Presidents of the United States. In 1790 the first President had this to say about the Indian problem:

The general Government will never consent to your being defrauded but will protect you in all your just rights.

I wonder what George Washington would do if he were chairman of the committee.

In 1820 President Monroe, in an address on the duty of Congress, pointed out—

If I survive the existing crisis, I will reform the Indian system.

Andrew Jackson in his farewell address said:

The States which had so long been retarded in their improvement, by the Indian tribes residing in the midst of them, are at length relieved from the evil; and this unhappy race—the original dwellers in our land—are now placed in a situation where we may well hope that they will share in the blessings of civilization and be saved from that degradation and destruction to which they were rapidly hastening while they remained in the States; and while the safety and comfort of our own citizens have been greatly promoted by their removal, the philanthropist will rejoice that the remnant of that ill-fated race has been at length placed beyond the reach of injury or oppression and that the paternal care of the general Government will hereafter watch over them and protect them.

Mr. President, what would President Jackson say were he here to-day?

One of the last remarks attributed to Mr. Lincoln was:

If they have outlived many things, they have not outlived the protection offered by the Constitution, treaties, and laws of the Congress.

The Indians have the protection of the Constitution; they have the protection of the laws; they have the protection of treaties; but they do not have the protection of those constituted to enforce the Constitution, of those constituted to enforce the treaties, and of those especially constituted to enforce the laws of the Congress.

President Grant in his second inaugural address to the Congress in 1873 said:

He—

Referring to the Secretary of the Interior—

is chiefly occupied in the management of the public lands * * * and with the conduct of Indian affairs, a troublesome and un-

satisfactory department, which has always been a reproach to the United States, and will apparently continue so till the Indians themselves disappear or become civilized.

He could make that statement here to-day; in fact, he could revise the statement by saying that if the present policy continues the disappearance of the Indians will only be a few sleeps ahead.

Theodore Roosevelt made this statement in his last address, delivered in his capacity as Vice President, at the State fair at Minneapolis, on September 2, 1901, which was not long ago as the life of the Nation goes:

Half a century ago Minnesota and the two Dakotas were Indian hunting grounds. We committed plenty of blunders, and now and then worse than blunders, in our dealings with the Indians.

This is not the first time this question has been brought up in Congress. Seventy-three years ago a speech was made in the Senate of the United States by an illustrious Senator, Sam Houston, of Texas. He opened his speech with this statement, which, true then, is, perhaps, equally true to-day:

I have very little hope that any appeal which I can make for the Indians will do any good.

Further on he said:

The Indian has a sense of justice, truth, and honor that should find a responsive chord in every heart.

* * * We rob them—

Said Senator Houston—

first of their native dignity and character; we rob them next of what the Government appropriates for them. If we do not do it in this Hall, men are invested with power and authority, who, officiating as agents or traders, rob them of everything which is designed for them.

Away back yonder, 75 years ago, said Senator Houston, not only were the Indians robbed by the agents of the Government, but they were likewise robbed in the Halls of Congress; and if this item shall go through another robbery will take place.

Mr. President, in some places it is considered honorable to meet a man on the highway, to give him a chance to run or fight, and to take his money; but here we are supposed to do it by law.

Not less than \$100,000,000—

Said Senator Houston—and this was in 1857, 73 years ago—

I learn from statistics, since the adoption of this Government, has been appropriated by Congress for purposes of justice and benevolence toward the Indians; but I am satisfied that they have never realized fifteen millions beneficially. They are too remote from the seat of Government for their real condition to be understood here; and if the Government intends liberality or justice toward them it is often diverted from the intended object and consumed by speculators.

It seems that Congress and the committee are not willing to take the word of those who have made a special investigation, but are relying upon the word of a man who lives in the caves of the Interior Department, who comes out annually and submits his recommendation, which is O. K'd by the Congress and becomes the law of the land.

At a later date, on April 5, 1880—that is somewhat more recent—another Senator, H. L. Dawes, of Massachusetts, made a speech upon this floor in this very Hall. In that address he said:

No tribe of Indians ever entered into a treaty with the United States that did not result in putting fetters upon them. They have been lassoed into imprisonment and confinement within limits that the necessities of growth in this Government required, and no sooner have we made treaties than we have gone to work deliberately to violate them.

But it is not treaty obligations alone of which the Indian has to complain. Why, sir, the treatment of the Indian agents and the Army and the whole department, with the Indian for long back, is covered with blots and stains and bad faith, and aggravations to the Indian, and provocation to violence on his part.

Again, Senator Dawes, of Massachusetts, said:

Sir, the Northern Cheyennes, taken by the Army from their home and the graves of their fathers among the cool mountain streams of the Northwest, down to the torrid jungles and malaria of the Indian Territory, there to fall before the ravages of disease, when they broke away and wandered through the wilds of western Kansas seeking their old home, were taken by the armed soldiers

of the United States and shut up in midwinter, in January, in a guardhouse, when the thermometer was 10° below zero, without clothing to protect them from the inclemency of the weather. They were told by the officer, whose official report I have here, "You shall have neither food nor drink nor fuel till you consent to go back to your doom in the Indian Territory," and there they were kept without either food or fuel or drink 4 or 5 days—the officer reports 4, the Indians say it was 7—in what the officer calls "the freezing-out process."

Again, Senator Dawes said:

Does anybody wonder, when these instances multiply around us every day, when flags of truce, like that under which General Canby fell at the hands of the Modocs, are violated by our own soldiers when they treat with the Indians; when the whole history of the dispensing of the Indian annuities and of the Indian appropriations is one long history of plunder; when we make our promises with no apparent intention of keeping them—is it to be wondered at that the Indian question has come upon us with difficulties almost passing solution?

Mr. President, if no one else knows, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee knows that I am not making this speech to consume time. I am making these feeble remarks only in order that a record may be made; and I think perchance once every 50 years, or at least once every 75 years, the country can afford to have one day set aside to have a speech made, although a feeble one. I have every conviction that had the Senator from Utah understood what this amendment meant, he would not have stood in its way for a moment. He would have been only too glad to accept an amendment early. But perhaps, having started out on a career, a campaign, a procedure, he does not feel like now accepting it. If he does not, I have no alternative except to make the record.

The Indian problem was almost the same in 1880 as it is to-day. Permit me to quote Senator Dawes again:

I had an interesting conversation a few days since with a chief of one of these tribes, as intellectual a man, as clear-headed, and as honest and truthful a man, according to the department and everybody else, as anyone could be; a man who realized the condition of the Indians, a man who made it a study as well as he could, of what, so far as his tribe was concerned, was the best solution of this question. I asked him if he could have for each male member of his tribe 160 acres of land allotted in severalty with the conditions that it could not be alienated for 25 years what he would say to that.

He was talking to an Indian chief.

It was a great while—

Says Senator Dawes—

before he could be made to comprehend what I meant, with an earnest desire to understand the full meaning of these words; and when at last he seemed fully to comprehend them, shaking his head, he said, "It would not do us any good; it might our children; but we do not understand your language; we do not know how to treat with white men; they always get the better of us; they would pluck us as you do a bird."

And here even the pinfeathers are proposed to be plucked by the guardian, the Congress of the United States.

Then I put the question in another form—

Says Senator Dawes.

Suppose you were so allotted, and a good, honest Indian agent—

He mentioned "a good, honest Indian agent."

My friend from Illinois [Mr. Davis] almost laughs when I say that—a good, honest Indian agent were put over you to keep off the white people and let you develop yourselves?

That problem has not changed in 50 years, Mr. President. Mention "a good, honest Indian agent" anywhere in the country, and you provoke a smile to-day. It has ever been so, at least for the past 50 years.

We don't know how to work very well.

This is an old Indian chief, now, speaking.

We were never taught to work. If our children could be brought up to understand your language and to understand what comes of work, to understand that what they earned to-day is theirs and they can hold it against the world, they could take these lands and they could take care of themselves and of us; but we can not do it.

Fifty years ago Senator Dawes had a policy. That is more than can be said to-day.

Said Senator Dawes:

Sir, you ought to improve them, make something of them—

We are. We are making them paupers at every session of the Congress.

Sir, you ought to improve them, make something of them, undertake to relieve yourselves of this burden which comes upon you as a just retribution for the long line of treatment in the past, which finds no justification in any standard of justice or of the right between the powerful and the weak. No one expects that you can make much out of the adult Indians. You can not teach them much how to work and support themselves. Industrious habits do not come by the force of enactments. Industrious habits are the result of long years of training, beginning with early life.

So said Senator Dawes; and when we ask that schools be provided to help these defenseless people a point of order is made, and the point sustained, and help can not be had.

Mr. President, perhaps the most distinguished orator America has produced had some idea about this matter. Robert G. Ingersoll, in an article published in the North American Review in 1891, said:

Nothing can be said to justify our treatment of the Indians. There is, however, this shadow of an excuse: In the old times, when we lived along the Atlantic, it hardly occurred to our ancestors that they could ever go beyond the Ohio; so the first treaty with the Indians drove them back but a few miles. In a little while, through immigration, the white race passed the line, and another treaty was made, forcing the Indians still farther west; yet the tide of immigration kept on, and in a little while again the line was passed, the treaty violated. Another treaty was made, pushing the Indians still farther toward the Pacific, across the Illinois, across the Mississippi, across the Missouri, violating at every step some treaty made; and each treaty born of the incapacity of the white men who made it to foretell the growth of the Republic.

James Bryce, in his American Commonwealth, has this to say about the American Indian problem:

That the Indian is confused in mind as to his status and very much at sea as to our ultimate purpose toward him is not surprising. For a hundred years he has been spun around like a blindfolded child in a game of blindman's buff. Treated as an enemy at first, overcome, driven from his lands, negotiated with most formally as an independent nation, given by treaty a distinct boundary which was never to be changed "while water runs and grass grows," he later found himself pushed beyond that boundary line, negotiated with again, and then set down upon a reservation, half captive, half protégé.

What could an Indian, simple thinking and direct of mind, make of all this? To us it might give rise to a deprecatory smile. To him it must have seemed the systematized malevolence of a cynical civilization. * * * Manifestly, the Indian has been confused in his thought because we have been confused in ours.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VANDENBERG in the chair). Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before the Senator does that, I would like to say that I had intended to ask that the Senate take a recess at 5 o'clock until Monday at 11 o'clock in conformity with the unanimous-consent agreement already entered into. If the Senator will withhold his suggestion until 5 o'clock—

Mr. BRATTON. With that understanding, I shall withhold the point.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I was not apprised of the fact that an agreement had been entered into to take a recess at 5 o'clock. I had hoped that an arrangement could be effected under which the motion the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] announced he would make to reconsider the vote by which the amendment offered by me was agreed to might be determined this afternoon. I was entirely willing to concede a reconsideration, as the Senator well knows, and so announced on the floor. I did feel, however, that we might be able to secure final action this afternoon.

Mr. SMOOT. So many Senators have gone for the afternoon that I think that should not be attempted to-day.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I presume, considering the lateness of the hour, it would perhaps be impossible to have the debate concluded and have a determination this after-

noon of the motion which I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania will offer for reconsideration.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, may I ask whether that motion is to be in order immediately upon convening Monday?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I so understand. I should like to have that arrangement made, because it is necessary for me to leave the city for Tuesday and Wednesday, and, of course, I should like to be here when the matter is determined Monday if it is possible to do so.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course the Senator from Oklahoma would have the floor. I wanted to ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether he had concluded his remarks.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have not concluded, and I will not have concluded for some time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am wondering whether an arrangement could be effected now to proceed with the matter to which I have referred. I would like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I will do my best to have my motion disposed of on Monday, out of deference to the Senator from Arkansas. I want to be heard on it for a few minutes before it is voted on, but I will try to get recognition as soon as I can after we meet on Monday, and I hope we can have a vote early on Monday. I certainly will not use it to delay disposition of the bill.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I interrupted the Senator from Oklahoma to suggest the absence of a quorum with no thought of taking him from the floor. I want that understood.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator from Oklahoma under those circumstances retains the floor, and if we take a recess now until Monday at 11 o'clock the Senator from Oklahoma will be entitled to recognition at 11 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. BRATTON. Precisely; that is why I raised the question at this time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I yielded only for the purpose of a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Oklahoma continues to have the floor. Will the Senator from Oklahoma indicate to whom he yields?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No one is asking me to yield, so far as I know.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, if at 5 o'clock the Senate is to take a recess, only two or three minutes will intervene between now and that hour—

Mr. MOSES. That was not the unanimous-consent agreement. The agreement is that on the conclusion of business to-day we shall recess until 11 o'clock on Monday. No hour was fixed for taking the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. But I stated—

Mr. MOSES. That the hope was to get through by 5 o'clock.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Why can we not settle the question of the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania to reconsider? I am still willing to have the vote reconsidered if a vote on the Senator's motion to postpone can be taken, and a final vote had on the amendment.

Mr. MOSES. I do not see how that could be done without the consent of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma will consent.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor, and will have it at 11 o'clock Monday. If the Senator from Oklahoma is willing that on convening Monday the Senator from Pennsylvania shall then make the motion, notice of which he has already entered. After that is disposed of the Senator from Oklahoma will be entitled to resume the floor, the floor having been utilized in the meantime under this agreement. I suppose that can be done, but under the situation as it now stands, the Senator from Oklahoma will be entitled to recognition at 11 o'clock Monday morning, and no one can prevent that.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think the Senator from Oklahoma will have any trouble in getting the floor as soon as the vote is taken.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. He is entitled to the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; he is entitled to it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I presume the Senator from Oklahoma will yield the floor for the purpose of disposing of the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania on the amendment that was adopted to-day?

Mr. HEFLIN. There will be no discussion on that motion, I understand.

Mr. REED. Oh, yes; there will be.

Mr. HEFLIN. How long would the discussion last?

Mr. REED. It ought not to last over an hour or an hour and a half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have no disposition to retain the floor unnecessarily. As I stated a while ago, it has been 50 years since a speech was made here in defense of the Indian tribes, and I think it is not out of place to devote a little time occasionally to these wards of the United States. We have a proposition pending before us wherein the department and the committee are recommending that private trust funds of one tribe be taken to maintain an agency for other tribes. I do not propose that that shall be done if I can help it. It is for the chairman of the committee to determine. If he forces me to speak on it, I shall make a record and depend upon the Congress; if not this one, then the next one, to correct an injustice that has been going on for years.

Mr. REED. May I make this suggestion? We all want to accommodate the Senator from Arkansas if we can, and we do not want to filibuster against the bill. If the Senator from Oklahoma will permit us to go ahead and dispose of the motion when we meet on Monday, I feel very certain that the Presiding Officer would be inclined to recognize him as soon as that was done.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. At this point let me say that it is agreeable to me to yield the floor, provided I can have the floor when the Interior Department appropriation bill is again laid before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. It can not be prevented.

Mr. HEFLIN. At what time does the Senate meet on Monday?

Mr. SMOOT. At 11 o'clock.

Mr. HEFLIN. Suppose we have an hour fixed, if we can, for the Senator from Oklahoma to take the floor on Monday?

Mr. MOSES. We can not do that except by a gentleman's agreement.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I suggest that immediately following the disposition of the motion relating to the amendment adopted to-day the Senator from Oklahoma resume the floor and accupy it to the conclusion of his argument.

Mr. REED. That is what I mean.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding of the situation.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I do.

Mr. BLACK. As I understood the Senator from Arkansas, there is no disposition to prevent the Senator from Pennsylvania from having a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. So far as I am concerned, I announced that I have no objection to a reconsideration, but I do not want a dilatory process to be resorted to and I do not wish to be in the attitude of contributing to it.

Mr. REED. I do not mean to be dilatory about it. I should want an immediate vote on my motion to make the

bill a special order and that ought to be done within an hour, I think.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I still do not see why it should not be done this evening.

Mr. REED. I do not think we have a quorum.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think we could soon get one.

Mr. SMOOT. Quite a number of Senators left for the day with the understanding that there would be no vote taken to-night.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I just came into the Chamber. I understand the subject under discussion is the application of the Senator from Pennsylvania to reconsider the vote by which the so-called Robinson amendment was agreed to. I do not want to let this occasion pass without saying that, as everybody knows, I am just as much in favor of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas as he is himself, or as any other Senator may be, but I do not want to be put in the attitude, and I hope the Senate will not put itself in the attitude, of taking snap judgment on anybody.

This is a controverted question. It must be conceded that those who favor the motion, and I am one of them, have taken up most of the time thus far in the debate. It must be conceded also that the administration is opposed to the amendment. It ought to be heard, and those who are opposed to the amendment ought to have the privilege of being heard by the Senate. The Senator from Pennsylvania, who was absent from the Chamber, as I was myself, at the time the vote was taken, when no roll call was had, was thus shut out of an opportunity to present to the Senate his views on the opposite side of the question. In all fairness and in accordance with the precedents of the Senate, the Senator from Pennsylvania ought to have the privilege of being heard by the Senate. I think the action of the Senate in adopting the amendment ought to be reconsidered by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say the only object I have in objecting as I did was to get the legislation through. I called attention to the fact that there was \$34,000,000 provided for in the bill that would put men to work in all the Western States. I had no idea that the bill would not be finished by this time to-day. I have not any objection at all to the proposition of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I shall vote for it now and give up all hope of passing the Interior Department appropriation bill within the next two or three days. I do not know how long the Senator from Oklahoma desires to talk.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I may say that when I shall have concluded there will be several Senators to follow me on the same matter.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know what plan has been made or how much time may be taken or how much time has been allotted to speak on the subject. I can not say as to that. I want to get the bill through just as quickly as possible.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. REED. I first want to thank the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] for the fairness of his view. Would it not be wise to agree now by unanimous consent to a reconsideration of the vote and further provide that the question of the adoption of the Robinson amendment be the pending question when we meet on Monday morning?

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection.

Mr. MOSES. The Senator will have to couple with that the understanding that the Senator from Oklahoma yields the floor for that purpose.

Mr. REED. Oh, yes; he has already expressed his willingness to do that. I am confident that we will have a vote before 1 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BRATTON. Should we not add to the suggestion of the Senator from Pennsylvania that we shall vote on the so-called Robinson amendment not later than 2 o'clock?

Mr. REED. Would not that require a quorum call at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it would not require a quorum call.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It would not require the presence of a quorum.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to any limitation. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to vote immediately to-night. But it would not be fair to the Senator from Pennsylvania to put such a condition to it. He ought to be put back in the same position he would have been in if the Senate had not voted.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is putting it pretty strong.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I wish to point out to the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators what actually happened. The absence of a quorum was suggested and the roll was called. The Vice President put the question on agreeing to my amendment. The vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to. There is no way to get Senators here except by the process that was pursued. When the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] later rose and asked unanimous consent for a reconsideration of the vote, I agreed to it.

It had been my purpose to have a record vote on the amendment. It was not taken for the simple reason that there appeared no necessity for insisting upon a record vote. The Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot], in charge of the bill, objected to the request of the Senator from Oregon. I do not want any Senator to proceed upon the theory that snap judgment was taken. Every process which could be pursued by the Senator in order to afford opportunity for motions was taken. I stated when I consented to a reconsideration that I had expected other Senators to speak. That was because I had heard that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] was to make a motion.

I was willing then and I am willing now to have a reconsideration of the vote in order that there may be an expression by the Senate through the medium of a record vote on the amendment, but I do not wish Senators to act upon the matter on the theory that any unfair process has been pursued by anyone here or that snap judgment was taken on anyone. It has not been done. The usual course has been pursued.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. I want to confirm what the Senator from Arkansas has said. I sat here through the entire progress of the matter.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite sure that is a correct statement of what happened.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. REED. Nothing is further from my thought than the suggestion that the Senator from Arkansas has been guilty of any unfairness. The circumstances were these. A quorum call was suggested by the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL]. He stated on inquiry at the time that he did it so as to provide a quorum to hear an address by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY]. The junior Senator from Arkansas had stated that he expected to speak at that time. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], who had agreed with me to remain on the floor and protect our rights in the matter, was at the moment engaged in conversation with another Senator and did not hear the question put.

No one is guilty of any unfairness in all this. The junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] changed his mind and did not speak, although he had told us he was going to do so. The attention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] was properly enough distracted at the time so that he could not interpose any remarks before the question was put. I had been absent from the floor about 15 minutes, assuming that the intention of those Senators would be carried out. That sort of thing often happens in the Senate. It is not culpable for us to be called from the floor or to leave the floor for a few minutes in the course of the day, but it has always been the practice in the Senate that we should not take advantage of one another in that way.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. To whom is the Senator referring when he says that we should not take advantage of one another in that way?

Mr. REED. I am referring to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who objected to a reconsideration of the motion.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I am glad the Senator from Pennsylvania made that clear.

Mr. REED. I am making it just as clear as I can. I am referring to the objection interposed by the Senator from Utah, which would have the effect of gagging me so I could not present my motion and could not in time present my views.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I had no idea of gagging anybody. What I wanted to do was to get the business of the Senate transacted. I saw no reason whatever for allowing the appropriation bill to go over and not be acted upon under the conditions that existed. If I had it to do over again, that is exactly what I would do again.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Manifestly the Senator from Utah thought there was a filibuster in progress.

Mr. SMOOT. I had not any doubt about it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And he was trying to prevent it.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not a filibuster on this bill. It is a filibuster on everything presented in the Senate.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas whether it is not possible to limit debate or otherwise fix a time when we can dispose of the matter?

Mr. REED. That is not going to be necessary. I think we will get to a vote before 1 o'clock. I am acting in the utmost good faith in this matter, and I know the Senator believes it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do.

Mr. REED. We will get to a vote on the motion early Monday.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I understand the Senator from Oklahoma has kindly consented to yield until this matter can be disposed of, and I think we can dispose of it within a couple of hours on Monday.

Mr. REED. Then I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas

was adopted be reconsidered and that the question of the adoption of the amendment be the pending question when the Senate meets on Monday.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Will the Senator be kind enough to couple with that request the suggestion that it be disposed of during the calendar day of Monday?

Mr. REED. I will gladly do that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Prior to 6 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. REED. Prior to 6 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That would suit my convenience.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the Senator will he not specify an hour.

Mr. REED. Very well; I ask that the final vote upon the amendment and all motions in regard thereto be taken not later than 6 o'clock on Monday next.

Mr. SMOOT. Why not make it not later than 2 o'clock?

Mr. REED. I think we will obtain a vote by 1 o'clock.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Make it 5 o'clock.

Mr. REED. Very well, make it not later than 5 o'clock.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Make it 4 o'clock.

Mr. REED. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, so there may not be any doubt about it, I ask that the request may be stated at the desk. Then we will know exactly what we are agreeing to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania restate his request? The clerks at the desk have not reduced it to writing. The Chair will also suggest that the Senate be in order so that the Senator from Pennsylvania may be heard.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the pending bill was adopted be reconsidered; that the question of the adoption of that amendment be the pending question when the Senate meets on Monday next; and that a final vote on the adoption of that amendment and a final vote disposing of all motions pertaining thereto be had not later than 4 o'clock on Monday afternoon next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. What is the further pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate take a recess, the recess being until 11 o'clock on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under its previous order, took a recess until Monday, January 19, 1931, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 17 (legislative day of January 5), 1931

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

George M. Foland, of Crown Point, Ind., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 40, with headquarters at Indianapolis, Ind. (Reappointment.)

APPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY

GENERAL OFFICERS

To be major general, reserve

Maj. Gen. Erland Frederick Fish, Massachusetts National Guard, from January 16, 1931.

To be brigadier general, reserve

Brig. Gen. Daniel Needham, Massachusetts National Guard, from January 16, 1931.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY

To be assistant to the Quartermaster General, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of four years from date of acceptance, with rank from January 24, 1931

Col. Alexander Elliot Williams, Quartermaster Corps, vice Brig. Gen. Francis H. Pope, assistant to the Quartermaster General, whose term of office expires January 23, 1931.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JANUARY 17, 1931

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who wouldst not break the bruised reed nor quench the smoking flax, we would look longingly toward Thee as our Father and breathe a little prayer for guidance. Be Thou our friend and Savior, and rule over our hearts and lives. Consider us, for we are imperfect, guilty of mistakes of judgment; we suffer for our frailties and faults. There is one heart in which we find a refuge—it is the Savior's. There is one hand that always lifts the torch—it is the Savior's. There is one star of hope that always burns—it is the Savior's. We thank Thee; and do Thou ever keep us in that pathway that leads to patriotic devotion, growth, and happiness. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4750. An act to authorize alterations and repairs to certain naval vessels; and

S. 5688. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of New Hampshire to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or dike across Little Bay at or near Fox Point.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On January 12, 1931:

H. R. 13130. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Bogue Chitto River between Sun and Bush, St. Tammany Parish, La.; and

H. R. 14446. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Prairie du Chien, Wis.

On January 14, 1931:

H. R. 11201. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Fox River, Wis., for the purpose of flood control.

On January 15, 1931:

H. R. 9985. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the national prohibition act," approved March 2, 1929; and

H. J. Res. 447. Joint resolution making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the drought and/or storm stricken areas of the United States," approved December 20, 1930.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, this day is the anniversary of the birth of one of the most famous Americans of the formative period of our Republic, Dr. Benjamin Franklin. We have all read the characterizations of him on the statue on Pennsylvania Avenue—"Printer, Philosopher, Patriot, Philanthropist."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may extend my remarks and include one or two short quotations with reference to the life of Doctor Franklin.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, present-day statesmen and public servants may well learn something as to their proper course from Doctor Franklin's attitude when he was tempted by considerations of both fame and fortune to betray the colonial cause in the controversy relating to the Stamp Act. He is reported as having said:

I thought it should not be expected of me to change my political opinions every time His Majesty thought fit to change ministers. * * * My rule, in which I have always found satisfaction, is never to turn aside in public affairs through views of private interests; but to go straight forward in doing what appears to me right at the time, leaving the consequences with Providence.

During the 84 years of his active and useful life, from January 17, 1706, to April 17, 1790, Franklin was engaged as a printer, publisher and editor, builder of forts for protection against the Indians, librarian, scientist (physicist), and diplomatist, in the last capacity representing the Colony of Pennsylvania before the House of Commons in advocacy of the repeal of the stamp act; in France, representing the Colonies to secure assistance in the War for Independence; and, finally, in the negotiations with both the British and French in drafting the treaty of peace which closed the Revolutionary War.

Franklin's greatest contribution toward the establishment of the Republic was probably his suggestion that representation in the lower House of Congress should be according to population, while in the Senate each State should have equal representation in membership. He illustrated his proposal by the homely observation:

When a broad table is to be made, and the edges of the planks do not fit, the artist takes a little from both, and makes a good joint.

Philosopher that he was, Franklin reflected on the closing years of his life as follows:

I have public business enough to keep me from ennui, and private amusement besides in conversation, books, my garden, and cribbage. * * * I have indeed now and then a little compunction in reflecting that I spend time so idly; but another reflection comes to relieve me, whispering, "you know that the soul is immortal; why then should you be such a niggard, of a little time, when you have a whole eternity before you?" * * * The last hours are always the most joyous.

He passed away in this happy mood, loved by his friends and by the Nation he helped to found.

EVENING SESSION—THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, January 23, it may be in order to move to take a recess until 8 o'clock that evening, that the House may sit not later than 11 o'clock p. m., and that at such session bills on the Private Calendar unobjected to may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House, starting at the beginning of the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, that is just for the one day, is it?

Mr. TILSON. That is all.

Mr. RANKIN. Just for Friday?

Mr. TILSON. Yes. It is anticipated that we shall not be permitted to use the day session on Friday for that purpose, and therefore I have asked that we be permitted to sit in the evening for that purpose solely.

Mr. RANKIN. There will be nothing considered except the Private Calendar?

Mr. TILSON. Nothing whatever.

Mr. RANKIN. I shall not object to that.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Reserving the right to object, I did not know this request was to be made, but on Friday evening there is to be a prevision showing of the play Cimarron, an historical play of Oklahoma, to which all the Members of the House and the Senate and official Washington are being invited at the request of the Oklahoma delegation. I wonder if some other night might not be selected, in view of that.

Mr. TILSON. I am sorry, but Friday is considered Private Calendar day. Of course, it is not necessary that all the Members be present at the session of the House on that occasion.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand it is not mandatory for the House to remain in session until 11 o'clock?

Mr. TILSON. No. My request is that at any time on Friday, preferably about 5 o'clock or a little thereafter, it might be in order to move to recess until 8 o'clock. It is not mandatory unless the House wishes to do so. It will be privileged if it is desired to make the motion.

Mr. STAFFORD. But I mean it is not mandatory that the session shall continue from 8 o'clock until 11 o'clock?

Mr. TILSON. The session can not be extended later than 11 p. m.

Mr. STAFFORD. But it is not mandatory to sit until 11?

Mr. TILSON. No. Adjournment may be voted at any time desired, not later than 11 o'clock.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask that for the reason that some Members have succumbed, under the pressure of considering these bills, prior to 11 o'clock.

INVITATION TO CONGRESS—CIMARRON

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I yield.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I would like to make a statement to the distinguished leader. The Oklahoma delegation and one of the Cabinet officers have arranged for a private showing of a great picture known as Cimarron in which the scenes are laid in the State of Oklahoma. President Hoover, Vice President Curtis, Members of the House, Members of the Senate, all the Cabinet officers, officials of the Army and the Navy, and others in the diplomatic set are going to be invited to attend a private showing of this picture at Keith's Theater on Friday night next. In view of the fact that the Oklahoma delegation has joined with others in the diplomatic set in extending these invitations, I am wondering if the distinguished leader can not set some other night in order that the Members of the House, the Members of the Senate, and others in Washington may have the opportunity of attending this private showing?

Mr. TILSON. In response to the very courteous request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] I have endeavored to find an equally suitable evening, but in almost every case I am confronted with some other event that is probably not as important as the show which the gentleman is going to put on, but which Members feel in a way obligated to attend. I have been unable to locate any evening other than Friday evening. As I say, the session will be for consideration of the Private Calendar only, under a unanimous-consent agreement, and it is not absolutely necessary for all Members of the House to be present. Everything is done by unanimous consent, and unless Members have some knowledge of the bills they can not throw much light upon the consideration of the bills, even if present. There are certain Members of the House who give careful consideration to all such bills, and I think they may be depended upon to stop all the bad ones. I think no harm will come if a liberal number of the Members of the House attend the Oklahoma show.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I appreciate the courteous statement the gentleman has made and the kindness he has extended to me, but Members of this House and their wives will be invited to attend this private showing of a picture which relates to the early formation of Oklahoma, by act of this body, and in view of the fact that this will be a sound picture, which many think will be better than that which was called *The Covered Wagon*, I sincerely hope that if the distinguished leader can find some other night that will be more satisfactory he will make a later announcement.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. GREENWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I yield.

Mr. GREENWOOD. This is the first opportunity we will have to consider the Private Calendar? It will not be considered at any intervening time between now and Friday night?

Mr. TILSON. No. It is not anticipated that we shall take up the Private Calendar before Friday evening.

Mr. GREENWOOD. And begin at the beginning?

Mr. TILSON. Begin at the beginning; and it is hoped that thereafter we may go on through the calendar from that point.

Mr. GREENWOOD. We will convene at 8 o'clock and continue not later than 11?

Mr. TILSON. Not later than 11.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] rise?

Mr. PATMAN. To prefer a unanimous-consent request along the same line as the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

I ask unanimous consent that the Ways and Means Committee be discharged from the further consideration of H. R. 3493—

The SPEAKER. The Chair declines to recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE AND THE JUDICIARY, AND DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 16110) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 16110, with Mr. RAMSEYER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, the unanimous-consent request which I asked the privilege of presenting a few minutes ago is as follows:

I ask unanimous consent that the Ways and Means Committee be discharged from the further consideration of H. R. 3493, a bill to provide for the immediate payment to veterans of the face value of their adjusted-service certificates, and that said bill be considered under the general rules of the House as a special order Tuesday, February 10, 1931, after the reading of the Journal of the preceding day, and the same be considered until finally disposed of, if the Ways and Means Committee fails to report a bill on this subject prior to that date.

Of course, the Speaker did not know exactly what my unanimous-consent request was, and I did not reach the House in time to inform him; but since it will go in the RECORD, I am going to renew my request at the first opportunity, because I believe it is a fair and reasonable one. In the first place, it asks that the Ways and Means Committee be discharged from the further consideration of this bill if a bill on that subject is not acted on before February 10, 1931. If it is acted on before that time, of course, this unanimous-consent request would not be applicable; but if the committee fails to act, then this bill would automatically come before the House on that date for consideration; and certainly I do not see any reason why that is not a reasonable request.

ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES SHOULD BE PAID IN CASH NOW

Now, my friends, I have asked for this time for the purpose of saying something about the payment of the adjusted-service certificates in cash. I know that this question is

being very much discussed and the reason for it is this: That we sincerely believe that the payment of this honest debt in cash now—a debt that has been publicly confessed by the Members of this House—is due to every veteran of the World War who served longer than 110 days, those serving under 110 days were paid in cash and do not hold certificates; that the payment of that debt will bring immediate prosperity to our Nation. We say that because we know there is a low per capita circulation of money in our country and we know that is causing a lack of purchasing power and that this lack of purchasing power is causing our deplorable condition. So anything we can do that will put more money into circulation and give more purchasing power will cause better business and a prosperous Nation.

AMOUNT EACH STATE WILL RECEIVE IF CERTIFICATES PAID IN CASH

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that I may be permitted to insert in the RECORD a statement prepared by Gen. Frank T. Hines showing the number of adjusted-service certificates in each State and the amount that each State would receive if my bill, H. R. 3493, is enacted into law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by General Hines referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Adjusted-service certificates in force December 1, 1930, showing State of residence

| Residence | Number | Amount |
|-------------------------------------|---------|--------------|
| Alabama..... | 48,862 | \$45,536,468 |
| Alaska..... | 1,357 | 1,369,518 |
| Arizona..... | 10,519 | 11,298,522 |
| Arkansas..... | 42,076 | 38,688,879 |
| California..... | 191,038 | 207,481,950 |
| Colorado..... | 32,914 | 32,863,428 |
| Connecticut..... | 42,415 | 45,878,847 |
| Delaware..... | 4,751 | 6,162,830 |
| District of Columbia..... | 27,148 | 27,732,736 |
| Florida..... | 37,325 | 36,976,981 |
| Georgia..... | 56,327 | 53,753,575 |
| Idaho..... | 12,894 | 12,668,040 |
| Illinois..... | 242,954 | 240,350,378 |
| Indiana..... | 92,296 | 90,730,556 |
| Iowa..... | 77,365 | 71,557,306 |
| Kansas..... | 54,970 | 53,411,195 |
| Kentucky..... | 61,417 | 58,204,508 |
| Louisiana..... | 51,577 | 47,590,744 |
| Maine..... | 20,699 | 20,542,767 |
| Maryland..... | 46,148 | 47,590,744 |
| Massachusetts..... | 131,996 | 141,745,095 |
| Michigan..... | 127,246 | 129,761,814 |
| Minnesota..... | 82,455 | 81,486,311 |
| Mississippi..... | 35,290 | 32,868,428 |
| Missouri..... | 108,208 | 102,713,837 |
| Montana..... | 17,306 | 17,461,352 |
| Nebraska..... | 38,683 | 38,688,879 |
| Nevada..... | 2,715 | 3,081,415 |
| New Hampshire..... | 11,876 | 12,325,661 |
| New Jersey..... | 111,298 | 117,436,154 |
| New Mexico..... | 9,840 | 9,586,625 |
| New York..... | 360,699 | 374,905,504 |
| North Carolina..... | 61,417 | 59,231,646 |
| North Dakota..... | 15,609 | 15,064,696 |
| Ohio..... | 175,429 | 180,433,973 |
| Oklahoma..... | 64,471 | 60,943,543 |
| Oregon..... | 33,032 | 35,235,084 |
| Pennsylvania..... | 250,759 | 265,001,690 |
| Rhode Island..... | 20,020 | 21,227,526 |
| South Carolina..... | 34,272 | 32,868,428 |
| South Dakota..... | 22,056 | 20,200,388 |
| Tennessee..... | 56,667 | 55,465,472 |
| Texas..... | 142,855 | 146,196,028 |
| Utah..... | 13,912 | 13,695,178 |
| Vermont..... | 7,805 | 8,559,487 |
| Virginia..... | 60,739 | 62,997,820 |
| Washington..... | 54,292 | 57,862,128 |
| West Virginia..... | 41,737 | 39,716,017 |
| Wisconsin..... | 85,170 | 80,459,172 |
| Wyoming..... | 10,858 | 10,956,143 |
| State not given..... | 339 | 342,379 |
| Panama..... | 339 | 342,379 |
| Philippine Islands..... | 3,393 | 4,108,554 |
| Porto Rico..... | 13,573 | 6,505,210 |
| Hawaii..... | 8,483 | 7,874,728 |
| Virgin Islands..... | 339 | 342,379 |
| Guam..... | 339 | 342,379 |
| Samoa..... | 60 | 74,641 |
| Canal Zone..... | 3,054 | 4,108,554 |
| France..... | 1,357 | 1,711,897 |
| Belgium..... | 339 | 342,379 |
| Italy..... | 5,429 | 4,793,312 |
| Germany..... | 339 | 342,379 |
| Austria..... | 339 | 342,379 |
| British Isles..... | 1,357 | 1,711,897 |
| Northern Russia and Siberia..... | 1,357 | 1,369,518 |
| Other parts of Europe and Asia..... | 3,393 | 3,081,415 |
| China..... | 1,018 | 1,369,518 |
| Japan..... | 102 | 106,405 |
| South America..... | 339 | 342,379 |
| Canada..... | 4,072 | 4,108,554 |

Adjusted-service certificates in force December 1, 1930, showing State of residence—Continued

| Residence | Number | Amount |
|--|-----------|---------------|
| Cuba..... | 339 | \$684,759 |
| Santo Domingo (Haiti), Dominican Republic..... | 339 | 342,379 |
| Mexico..... | 679 | 684,759 |
| New Zealand..... | 25 | 31,019 |
| Australia..... | 67 | 71,163 |
| India..... | 81 | 85,193 |
| Central America..... | 116 | 142,005 |
| West Indies..... | 130 | 135,105 |
| Newfoundland..... | 15 | 15,546 |
| Azores..... | 29 | 33,350 |
| Africa..... | 67 | 81,789 |
| Oceania..... | 5 | 4,860 |
| Grand total..... | 3,393,914 | 3,424,575,640 |

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. I have introduced a bill similar to the one the gentleman is discussing. Will the gentleman state what the total amount of these certificates will be?

Mr. PATMAN. I shall be glad to do that. In answer to the gentleman from Georgia, I will state that the total amount due on these certificates is \$3,424,575,640.

Mr. EDWARDS. That is the face of the certificates.

MATURITY OR FACE VALUE SHOULD BE PAID

Mr. PATMAN. That is the face value of these certificates. I am going to tell you why we believe all of the certificates should be paid in cash. I know that if you mention that to the Member of Congress who has not had an opportunity or has failed to inform himself about this law he will tell you he does not favor paying the face value; that the face value is too much; but if he will take the time to study the law and the intent of Congress he will find it is not too much and that the face value, or practically all of it, is due during the year 1931.

Take a concrete case. Take the case of a veteran who served in the World War for 210 days in home service and served 200 days overseas. For his home service he receives \$1 extra a day in adjusted compensation and for his overseas service an extra concession of debt amounting to \$1.25 a day. So the aggregate amount for 210 days' home service, or \$210, and 200 days overseas, or \$250 at \$1.25 a day, would be \$460. When Congress confessed this debt to him it said, "Yes; back six years ago Congress remembers that it paid you \$60 as a bonus." Congress did pay to each veteran of the World War, whether he was a buck private in the rear rank having served one day or two years, or whether he was a major general drawing \$8,000 a year—Congress paid or authorized a payment to each of those veterans the sum of \$60. Why? When a veteran went into the service and after having received a uniform the first thing he did was to pull off everything from his hat to his shoes and give them to the Red Cross, and this clothing was sent to Belgium and to France to relieve conditions over there. So when the veterans were discharged they had no money because they had received very little for their services after paying insurance, allotments, laundry, mending his own clothes and shoes, and other expenses, including a monthly payment on a Liberty bond, and Congress gave them \$60 for the purpose of buying a suit of clothes, and it was stated on the floor of this House and on the floor of the Senate that this was the object and intent of this gift of \$60. But when the adjusted service certificate law passed, Congress said, "Yes; we paid you \$60 and now we are going to deduct that \$60 from this \$1 a day for home service and \$1.25 a day for overseas service. We are going to deduct that from your pay. Of course, we are not going to make the major generals pay their \$60 back, and we are not going to make the officers who received \$6,000 or \$8,000 a year, with additional allowances, pay their \$60 back, or the veteran who served only two or three days, but you fellows who get adjusted-service certificates will be compelled to pay this \$60 back." So you reduce that \$460 by \$60 and that makes a man's adjusted-service credit \$400. Then the Government says, "I will add on 25 per cent because you have got to wait 27 years for your money and make that amount \$500, and that \$500

will purchase a \$1,000 insurance certificate or endowment policy due January 1, 1945."

Well, the soldier takes this. He has no other alternative. This is due in 1945.

Now, my proposal is this. Do not give the veterans any bonus. Do not give the veterans any gratuity, but do for them exactly what you have done for other people. Do not give them that 25 per cent extra—count that off—but put back the \$60. It ought to be put back. Nobody else had to pay their \$60 back. So put back that \$60 in with the \$400 and give the veteran 6 per cent interest compounded annually, not from 1925, but from 1918, when his service was rendered, and whenever you do that, that will amount to about 95 or 96 per cent of the face value of the adjusted-service certificate as due in 1945.

REASONABLE DEMAND

Can you say this is unreasonable? Is it unreasonable to say that the Government should pay the veteran 6 per cent compounded annually? If you say that you say it is unreasonable for the Government to charge the veteran 6 per cent compounded annually for his own money. Now, if it is fair for the Government to charge the veteran 6 per cent compounded annually for his own money, which the Government has done, certainly you will say it is fair for the Government to pay the veteran 6 per cent compounded annually from the time the services were rendered to his country, for which this debt was confessed. The Treasury Department is paying 6 per cent interest on all tax refunds for the year 1918 or any other years. Therefore, my friends, I say that 95 or 96 per cent of that money is actually due now, and since it is so near the total amount or the face value, the additional small sum ought to be given him for waiting these 12 or 13 years.

CONFESSION OF A DEBT

Mr. CROWTHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I shall always be pleased to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. CROWTHER. I look with some favor on some method of making this payment, but does the gentleman think it is exactly fair to use the expression "a confession of debt"? I do not think that was ever used at the time we granted the adjusted compensation.

Mr. PATMAN. I will say to my friend I think it is fair, because other people who received adjusted pay had a debt confessed to them, and if it is a confession of a debt to war contractors of \$3,000,000,000, if it is a confession of a debt to the railroads of \$1,600,000,000 for adjusted pay, and if it was a confession of a debt of \$6.33 a day extra pay for those veterans who stayed over here and worked on the public roads, then it is certainly a confession of a debt to those veterans who were only getting \$1 for home service and \$1.25 for overseas service.

COMMITTEE HEARING SOUGHT

I am mighty glad the gentleman has asked me that question, and now I want to ask him a question with respect to the Ways and Means Committee. I understand the chairman of that committee has called a meeting of the committee for Tuesday. Of course it is not on this bill but is on a bill that other people are interested in getting through on another subject, a bill Mr. Mellon wants passed. I am glad the chairman is here, and I am glad he is going to call a committee meeting. That committee, I understand, has not met this session. There has been no reason, to my knowledge, why this committee should not have met before this time and given consideration to these different proposals; but the committee has not met and is meeting for the first time this session next Tuesday. At that meeting I wish the distinguished gentleman from New York, who has always expressed interest and feeling for the veterans of the World War and the veterans of other wars, would make a motion or at least do something toward getting a hearing before that committee on the proposal to pay the veterans the adjusted-service certificates. I am asking for a hearing on all the proposals; and I hope my friend, as a member of

that great committee—the Committee on Ways and Means—will use his influence and his power and his prestige to get a hearing on these important proposals for the veterans and other people who want a prosperous nation.

ONE HUNDRED PER CENT SHOULD BE PAID

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement and has advanced a proposal here that I have not heard stated before. I want to ask the gentleman if he has introduced a bill carrying out his idea?

Mr. PATMAN. Why, certainly I have introduced such a bill, but I am not arguing for my bill only.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I refer to the idea which the gentleman has advanced with reference to paying 95 per cent of the total amount.

Mr. PATMAN. No; I think 100 per cent should be paid. Does not the gentleman think they ought to have the 4 or 5 per cent for waiting 12 or 13 years?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I would suggest the gentleman introduce his bill, so that in the event there is a hearing, then his proposal will be before the Ways and Means Committee. I am in sympathy with his suggestion.

Mr. PATMAN. When we have a hearing, of course, if the committee wants to cut it down to 95 per cent, the actual amount due, nobody would object to that. All the veterans want is a square deal. They want the same principle invoked for them that has been invoked for others.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I want to commend my colleague for his very able and zealous effort that he has been making in behalf of the legislation. I wish publicly to state that my colleague has been active in aggressively promoting this legislation. I would like to have him permit me to read a telegram that I have just received.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I only have 20 minutes. I will ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the telegram received by his colleague may be inserted in the RECORD at this point. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The telegram is as follows:

ROCKDALE, TEX., January 16, 1931.

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
House Office Building:

At a regular meeting of Carlyle Post 358, a resolution was adopted to indorse Patman bill, H. R. 3493, providing immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates. Will greatly appreciate your efforts in bringing this legislation about.

HARRY MOODY, Commander.
M. N. STRICKER, Adjutant.

Mr. PATMAN. I am sorry that I can not put all the telegrams and petitions in the RECORD that I have received. They run into thousands. I am filing them all in the House as rapidly as I can and they are being referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

VETERANS WHO WORKED ON PUBLIC ROADS DURING WAR RECEIVED \$6.33
A DAY ADJUSTED PAY

Now, gentlemen, I want to call your attention to a proposition that is on all fours with this. When the war was over and the agricultural and the post office bills were before the House there was a rider attached in the Senate providing that all veterans of the World War during a certain period who worked on the public roads in the United States should receive adjusted pay equal to the difference between what the Government paid them as privates or corporals or sergeants and the amount a civilian would have received under the same circumstances rendering identical service.

I went to the Bureau of Public Roads and we got this old pay roll, which is typical of the form used, and it showed that veterans worked on the public roads side by side with civilians and that those veterans received adjusted pay.

Here is just one illustration—Barney Allen, of Tennessee, whose military title was a corporal, received pay of \$1.66½ a day while the civilian working by his side received \$8 a day—the difference being \$6.33. Barney Allen received \$158.23 for that month's work in adjusted pay in addition to his regular pay of \$1.66½.

He worked side by side with a civilian and this Congress said that that man is entitled to adjusted pay equal to the difference he received and what he would have received as a civilian. The amount was \$6.37 a day, or \$158.25 for the month. He was paid this and he did not have to wait until 1945.

For services rendered by soldiers, sailors, or marines on road-construction work done under the supervision of military officers of the War Department outside of military reservations or cantonments, in accordance with section 9 of the act making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, approved February 28, 1919 (40 Stat. 1189, 1925), on road leading from Fayetteville, N. C., to Camp Bragg, N. C., in county of Cumberland (Big Ben District), State of North Carolina, during the month of July, 1918

| Line No. | Name | Address to which check is to be mailed | Military title | Rate of pay ¹ | Civil title for class of work performed | Rate of pay | Difference in rate of pay | Detail statement of services performed (If work done on hourly basis, show number of hours constituting a day's work, i. e., if 10 hours constituted a day's work, show the figure 10 in the proper column, and if less than a day's work was performed show actual number of hours worked) | Total days or hours | Difference paid by the Department of Agriculture | |
|----------|-------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------|---------------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| 1 | Barney Allen... | Woodbine Branch, Nashville, Tenn. | Corporal..... | 1.66½ | Tractor mechanic.. | \$8.00 | \$6.33 | From the 1st to the 30th, inclusive, except Sundays and holidays. | 25 | \$158.25 | A. S. 27180, July 23, 1921. |
| 2 | Philip Weber... | Marfa, Tex..... | Private, first class.. | 1.56½ | Foreman..... | 5.20 | 3.63 | do..... | 25 | 90.75 | |
| 3 | Hillsman Davis... | do..... | do..... | 1.56½ | do..... | 5.20 | 3.63 | do..... | 25 | 90.75 | |
| 4 | Roy Day..... | Blackwell, Tex... | Corporal..... | 1.66½ | Tractor operator.. | 4.00 | 2.33 | do..... | 25 | 58.25 | Do. |
| 5 | George Bero..... | Marfa, Tex..... | Sergeant..... | 1.92½ | Assistant distributor. | (?) | 5.57 | do..... | 25 | 139.25 | A. S. 30548, May 20, 1922. |

¹ Including allowances for commutation of quarters, heat, and light for officers and value of subsistence for enlisted men of the Army.

² \$225 per month or engineer, \$7.50 per day.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
April 28, 1921.

I certify that this pay roll (in one sheet) is correct; that the records of this office indicate the persons named hereon were detailed for work on roads outside of the limits of military reservations or cantonments in accordance with requirements of section 9 of the act of Congress making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

HARRISON HALL,
Adjutant General.

NOT A "BONUS"—ADJUSTED PAY

Mr. PATMAN. Senator McCumber in reporting the bill to the Senate in 1924, said:

Any discussion of this bill, its provisions and purposes, would be lacking in fairness and justice if it failed at the outset to correct a general misnomer of the bill itself. This proposed legislation is generally referred to as the "soldiers' bonus bill." No name could be applied that would be more irrelevant. It is worse than erroneous. It is just what its title reads, a bill to provide adjusted compensation for the veterans of the World War. It is not a bonus bill, and fairness to the country and soldiers alike requires that we should exclude the word "bonus" in referring to it.

This is the bill that was enacted and is known as the adjusted compensation act.

OTHERS PAID IN CASH

Now, gentlemen, I want to invite your attention to the fact that when the war was over the war contractors came to Congress and admitted that they did not have a legal contract. But they wanted adjusted pay, and they got adjusted pay amounting to approximately \$3,000,000,000. The railroads got more than a billion dollars on the same principle. These men should not wait until 1945. When this bill was passed it was said, "Oh, no; we haven't got the money to pay it in cash."

I will tell you why it was not paid in cash. Mr. Mellon, as usual, when veterans' legislation is considered, himself makes an incorrect estimate of the condition of the Treasury. He said in 1924, "We are going to have a deficit around \$347,000,000 during this fiscal year." At the end of

I submit to you, my friends, that when you allow the veterans for home service \$1 a day and the overseas man \$1.25 a day it ought to be paid as of 1918 when the service was rendered.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert this table in the RECORD. It is one of many hundred such pay rolls.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to insert a table in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The table is as follows:

the fiscal year we had a surplus of more than \$600,000,000. He missed it by \$1,000,000,000. Close for Mr. Mellon, under the circumstances.

Now, when we propose to correct that error he said, "Oh, we can not do that; we can not afford to pay that sum in cash."

MR. MELLON MADE FALSE STATEMENT

But I am not willing to follow Mr. Mellon on veteran legislation, and I do not believe that you are willing to follow him; and if you do, I do not believe that you can defend yourself in so doing, because he has the reputation of always making a false, inaccurate, and misleading statement in regard to the condition of the Treasury when veteran legislation is being considered by Congress. I will tell you how the money can be raised so that it will not upset the economic situation of this Nation. Our war debt 10 years ago was \$26,000,000,000. It was all right then to pay the railroads and the war contractors and other people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

NO INCREASE IN TAXES NECESSARY TO PAY THIS DEBT

Mr. PATMAN. I shall make this very short. I would like to go into it in full. But the gentleman from Alabama is crowded for time, and I do not want to impose upon the other Members of the House who are waiting to speak. The war debt has been reduced \$10,000,000,000 in 10 years, and \$7,000,000,000 faster than Congress said it should be reduced. My idea is to divert the payments from the war debt to this other war debt, the adjusted-service certificates. It is just as much a war debt as any other obligation of our Government. Pay it off in three or four years, and then continue to pay on the war debt as we have done in the past. That will not cause an increase in taxes, not one penny increase, and it will not cause a change in our tax

law, not as much as the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." We can go on as we have in the past, and whenever you pay this money, and it goes into every nook and corner of America, we will have prosperity in our Nation. There is no holding our country down or retarding its progress if we have a sufficient circulating medium, which always brings with it a sufficient purchasing power, and with sufficient purchasing power we are bound to have prosperity.

AMERICAN LEGION'S ATTITUDE ON THE PROPOSAL

Much is being said about the American Legion being opposed to this legislation. I want to explain that briefly. It happens that I am a member of the American Legion. I am proud of the Legion. It is a fine organization, a very worthy and deserving one. I stand for everything that it stands for. The rank and file of the American Legion, 95 per cent, if permitted to express their wishes here on the proposal that Members of Congress have presented, providing for the payment of these certificates in full, would be in favor of it, but the leader, Mr. O'Neil, the present national commander, says that he can not officially favor the proposals because at Boston the proposal was introduced and it was tabled. The merits were not discussed; but he says after consulting the executive committee that we are bound by that and that the American Legion can not afford to initiate the legislation.

DELEGATES SINCERE AND SOBER

I want to tell you about that Boston convention. I was there, and I believe I witnessed everything that happened on the floor of that convention. Much has been said in the newspapers about so many veterans being there drunk and not paying any attention to what they were doing. That report is absolutely false. I have never attended a convention where there were more serious-minded men as delegates on the floor than there were at Boston. I did not see any more evidence of drunkenness on that floor than I have seen here as a Member of this House, and I have never seen a Member on the floor of this House under the influence of intoxicating liquor. There was no evidence of liquor on that floor.

I did not see half a dozen drunks on the streets or elsewhere in Boston while I was there. The 1,500 delegates were sober, serious-minded men who went there from every section of the United States to look after the Legion's business, and did record the Legion as favorable to much legislation that will be of substantial assistance to the veterans of the World War if enacted.

UNFAIR TACTICS USED AT CONVENTION

There was one thing about that convention that I do not think was fair but the Legion as an organization did not initiate it. The proposal was presented to pay these adjusted-service certificates, and immediately after it was presented a delegate moved to cut off debate. His name was Quinn. He used to be the national commander of the American Legion. When the proposal was presented Mr. Quinn got up. He made a speech against it and closed his speech with a motion to table the proposal. Mr. Hanford McNider seconded that motion. They are the two men who caused debate to be cut off in that convention and thereby succeeded in applying the gag rule. The merits of the proposal were not presented. Debate was cut off. There was nothing to be done except to call for the yeas and nays, which I did; I called for the yeas and nays, and the New York and Massachusetts delegations joined with Texas, which made up the required number to get a record vote. We got the yeas and nays. Delegates slipped around and said that this was a political matter; that it would cause long debate if not tabled; that it was the last day and the last hour of the convention and we should get rid of it without discussion; and that we ought not to get the Legion into politics. They killed the proposal—not on its merits—but on a motion to table, which carried, and now the executive committee of the American Legion claims—at least a majority of them do—they can not afford to say a word one way or the other because of that motion to table that proposal. Although it is

well known 95 to 98 per cent of the members of that organization favor the proposal. The delegates there would have adopted the proposal had it been discussed or understood, but the opportunity was denied.

WHO ARE MR. QUINN AND MR. McNIDER

I want to tell you now about Mr. Quinn. Mr. Quinn is a man who has a splendid war record and has worked faithfully for the American Legion. Mr. McNider also has a fine record both as a soldier and legionnaire. They are always talking about keeping the Legion out of politics, and they are in politics all of the time and are national officers of the American Legion at the same time. Mr. Quinn holds a political office now. Last November he was elected to an office in Los Angeles County, Calif., a county supervisor, and he is always saying to keep the Legion out of politics, yet he holds a political office at the same time he holds a Legion office. He is drawing \$150 a month from the Government as a retired emergency officer for the same disabilities that a man who served in the ranks, an enlisted man, is drawing \$30. He is the gentleman who made the motion to cut off debate and to apply the gag rule. Mr. McNider, the man who seconded that motion, is the minister to Canada, appointed by the President of the United States a few months ago. He is the beneficiary of a political office, and yet as the holder of that political office he—the same as Mr. Quinn—is a member of the national executive committee of the American Legion, an ex officio member.

I have not heard of his resigning, I have not heard of his refusing to attend any meeting on that account, and it is the first time in the history of the Legion to my knowledge where a man is serving as an officer of the American Legion and yet at the same time holds a political office. The same situation is true as to Mr. Quinn. I understand it is not a violation of the constitution or the by-laws of the Legion. They are perfectly within their rights, but it just happens that I have not had knowledge of such a situation heretofore and doubt the wisdom of it. As members of the executive committee, why should they want to apply the gag rule and refuse a free discussion and a fair vote on the proposal? Mr. Quinn receives compensation from the Government besides holding a salaried position. Mr. McNider is, I am informed, several times a millionaire and one of the wealthiest men in Iowa. Probably these gentlemen were not in a position to view this question from the standpoint of veterans who are in distress and who have wives and children in need. Many of them are being put out on the street with sick wives and sick children because the rent is overdue, although the Government owes them many hundreds of dollars, which if paid would relieve their distressing condition. I hope these gentlemen will realize their mistake and assist in getting the Legion behind this proposal.

WHAT OTHERS HAVE DONE WHEN ANNOUNCING FOR POLITICAL OFFICE

I know what I did when I was post commander of a post in Texas. When I announced for political office, I resigned. Under the Legion constitution one does not have to resign as post commander until elected, as I understand it, but regardless of rules or constitution one should not hold a permanent position in the Legion and at the same time hold a political position. Other parties have done the same thing. We do not deserve any credit for it. We are simply doing what we should do to keep the Legion out of politics, but yet, when you bring up a proposal that will help the rank and file, and 95 or 98 per cent of them want this legislation pressed because they know it is just and honest and will not only help them but will help all the people of America in bringing about a prosperous nation, the opponents come out and say, "No; that is politics."

MANY VETERAN ORGANIZATIONS INDORSE MOVEMENT

The national organization of the American Legion has not indorsed this proposal, but tens of thousands of individual members of the Legion and hundreds of posts have indorsed it. The Legion, although a worthy and deserving organization, only represents about one-fifth or one-sixth of the World War veterans.

Other worthy and deserving organizations of veterans of the World War have indorsed the proposal. Among them are the Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Fleet Reserve Association, Air Service Mechanics, Society of the Fifth Division, and many others. These organizations are entitled to credit for the attention that is now being given this legislation.

IF BILL NOT PASSED, FIGHT JUST COMMENCED

My friends, if this is not passed at this session, although I think it will be passed in some form, this fight has just commenced. It is not a partisan fight. You will never hear of me getting into partisan politics on this question. It is a fight by Republicans and Democrats to right a wrong that has been perpetrated upon the enlisted men of this Nation, and this fight will continue until this legislation is passed, and if it is not passed at this session or other legislation is not passed to break this panic I shall be glad to contribute everything I can in order to force a special session in order that the right kind of legislation to make our Nation prosperous might be passed. [Applause.]

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas yields back one minute.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN], member of the committee.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, at the present time it is the supreme aim of everyone from President Hoover down to the humblest legislator to do everything within his or her power to relieve the unemployment situation which confronts us. Outside of the destroying effects of the drought, which fortunately involved but a portion of the country, there is no existing condition impossible of correction. It is by relieving distress in the drought-stricken area and to correcting the lack of employment in other sections that we are now addressing ourselves. That the foundations of the Republic are unshaken, the fundamentals of industry and finance are sound, and for the most part there is a display of unified action toward the desired end, is generally recognized and appreciated. These factors have a stimulating influence and are aiding daily in the expansion of a feeling of optimistic determination to work our way out.

This bill carrying, as it does, the funds for our foreign trade promotion activities, as well as for the conduct of our foreign and domestic relations generally, is probably of more importance at this time than for some years past.

The chairman of the subcommittee very graphically and comprehensively explained the bill in its major portions yesterday. I wish to address myself to some of the details in connection therewith.

Your committee has approached the task of preparing it for your consideration, with the thought always in mind as to how the specific item recommended would benefit the universal undertaking of assisting business to return to its former prosperous condition. While this task is entirely void of any romance or spectacular situations and fails to carry any strong emotional appeal, it nevertheless has its thrills. And the greatest of all will be to again see additional workmen profitably engaged so they can again keep their families in comfort and contentment, as is their due. When President Hoover was Secretary of Commerce some years ago, he suggested during that period more ways whereby agriculture, industry, manufacturing, and mining might be benefited, and wasteful practices eliminated, than had ever been thought of before. Many of these suggestions are now being used as the basis of reorganization and readjustment plans for carrying out programs to meet existing conditions. These suggestions were most helpful in settling major business disturbances immediately following the World War. They may be altered somewhat in their application, but the principle remains the same.

If this were the first major disturbance to confront our Nation, we might require a somewhat longer time to work our way out of it. Or if our interests were purely domestic, or local, if you please, so that we could actually be the

masters of our fortunes, the problem would be much less complicated, and we therefore would be able to make a much more rapid recovery, providing, of course, that agriculture has the proper kind of crops during this year and is able to dispose of them at a figure to restore the farmers' purchasing power. The problem, however, is not domestic or local. It is world-wide. But there are encouraging world signs.

Not very long ago Doctor Wu, the very able minister from China—and it must be borne in mind that the disturbances there and in India involve practically 40 per cent of the world's population—made a very interesting and illuminating talk over the radio, from which I venture to quote:

People throughout the world, in general and in America in particular, may or may not appreciate the momentous significance to them as well as to the Chinese of what is going on in China. It is probably difficult for most of them to realize that there is now taking place in that country something which historians will, in all probability, record as one of the most important epochs of human history, a turning point in the civilization of the world.

Let me explain. I make this statement not merely because the Chinese Government seems to have finally succeeded in bringing about a period of peace to the country. And peace means constructive work on the part of the Government and of the people and prosperity to the country as a whole, with a resultant effect on countries other than China, in bringing about increased trade relations and helping to solve, to some extent, the problems of economic depression and unemployment which seem to be so general throughout the world. I make this statement because I believe the meaning and character of the movement which has been going on in China for something like a generation justify it.

Yes; change is the watchword in China to-day. Whatever truth there might have been in the old days in the phrase "Unchanging East," there is no doubt nowadays about two things; one is, greater changes are going on in China to-day than anywhere else in the world; the second is, faster changes are going on in China to-day than anywhere else in the world. These changes affect the welfare and the future of the country whose territory is as huge as the continent of Europe and whose population is as enormous as that of Europe. Do I exaggerate then when I say that events taking place there may represent a turning point in the civilization of the world? For what is happening to a quarter of the population of the globe can not be a matter of indifference to the other three-quarters.

About two months ago a round-table conference on India was opened in London by King George to consider the future form of government for the millions of people in that vast domain. During the progress of the sessions a number of extraordinary concessions to the ideal of self-government have been foreshadowed. It is now probable that a pledge of dominion status will be given by Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald. In a speech at the conference some time ago Lord Reading was quoted as having said:

Unless some argument is adduced which calls for a change of views I do not hesitate to say now that our recommendation to the Liberal Party in Parliament will be for Great Britain to go to the full length of granting to India a government responsible to its own elected legislature, except in matters of self-defense and foreign relations, which must for the time being be left as Crown subjects, and with certain reservations in financial affairs.

If boycotting can be removed from the Indian trade it will mean great activity in Lancashire and Yorkshire, and if the looms there become active, it means more cotton and more supplies from America. Therefore, if 40 per cent of the world's population becomes peaceful in its activities and building up its governments and supplying the wants of that great number of people, surely America will feel the effects thereof.

I think these statements may be safely accepted as reflecting conditions in those countries. Other equally authentic quotations could be cited as reflecting conditions in other sections of the world. True, some of them are not as encouraging as the declarations of Doctor Wu and Lord Reading, but all of them indicate that serious and determined efforts are being made and the situation is engaging the attention of the best minds in the respective countries. On the whole, the aspect presented as a world picture is promising for an early improvement and forward-going movement.

According to testimony given at the hearings on this bill by Mr. William L. Cooper, Director of the Bureau of Foreign

and Domestic Commerce, our foreign trade last year receded in about the same recession as the foreign trade of other countries. But, said Mr. Cooper, the services of the bureau actually increased, showing that in times of stress American business firms turn to the bureau immediately for assistance. To meet these demands the appropriation has been proportionately increased, as your committee felt that it would be money judiciously expended.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I yield.

Mr. ARENTZ. I came in late, and I do not know whether the gentleman spoke about the influence of the low price of silver or not.

Mr. ACKERMAN. I was going to deal with that a little later, but inasmuch as the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ARENTZ] has mentioned it, the purchasing power of both China and India has been greatly curtailed on account of the great decrease in the value of silver, silver bullion having gone down from \$1.29 an ounce, a normal price in times past, to the neighborhood of 30 cents an ounce. Consequently the purchasing power of both India and China has been greatly curtailed.

I append herewith some excerpts indicating the service given by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and results to American business houses. They will be the more interesting when considered in connection with the cost per service. Mr. Cooper stated that the cost per service during the past year, based on the appropriation, worked out at \$1.25. This is a reduction of \$1.03 per service from the year 1921-22, when the bureau first started making records of this kind.

At this point I want to call attention to how greatly our investments have increased abroad. They have increased from \$8,461,000,000 in 1923 to \$14,366,000,000 in 1930.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I yield.

Mr. HARE. I am wondering whether the gentleman has the figures by years?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I have them by years, but just to save time I did not read them. I will insert them in the Record at this point:

Estimates made by Department of Commerce of private long-term American investments abroad, January 1

| | Average of range |
|------|------------------|
| 1930 | \$14,366,000,000 |
| 1929 | 13,558,000,000 |
| 1928 | 12,240,000,000 |
| 1927 | 11,268,000,000 |
| 1926 | 10,460,000,000 |
| 1925 | 9,588,000,000 |
| 1924 | 8,719,000,000 |
| 1923 | 8,461,000,000 |

United States tourist expenditures overseas

| | |
|--------------------|---------------|
| Calendar year 1927 | \$465,000,000 |
| Calendar year 1928 | 516,000,000 |
| Calendar year 1929 | 517,000,000 |

In addition, the Department of Commerce has compiled tourists' expenditures overseas. They are only for three years. They run from \$465,000,000 in the year 1927 to \$517,000,000 in the calendar year 1929.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does that figure against us in trade?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Well, these are the expenditures of tourists, not the balance of trade.

Mr. KNUTSON. Do they enter into the computation of the balances?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I suppose they do, in what they term the "invisible" balance of trade.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman make a distribution by countries?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Unfortunately we do not have it worked out to that extent. It would be very illuminating if we had that.

Now at this point I want to call the attention of the committee, if I may, to the wonderful service that is being given by the Post Office Department in connection with air mail service to Central and South America as conducted by the

Pan American-Grace Airways. It is quite illuminating. Now that private parties have the contract the Post Office Department supervises it, and in this connection I have received a very interesting report from Hon. W. Irving Glover, Second Assistant Postmaster General, giving a description of the activities of the air mail department from the time the Government assumed it until they turned it over to these private contractors.

With the permission of the committee, I would like to insert in my remarks this document. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to insert this document at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington.

DIVISION OF AIR MAIL SERVICE—AIR MAIL

The first aerial mail transportation may be traced back to 1870, when in that year letters were carried out of beleaguered Paris by free balloons, cast adrift in the winds. The first of such flights was made on September 23, 1870, and carried 500 pounds of mail. This service, of course, was not satisfactory, as the balloons could not be controlled and were just as liable as not to land in enemy territory. Some of them were carried by the winds many miles from Paris before they came down, and some of them were never heard of after leaving Paris.

In the year 1911 demonstrations of airplane mail service were made in India, England, and the United States. The first air mail service in the United States, however, was conducted at the aviation meeting at Nassau Boulevard, Long Island, N. Y., during the week September 23 to 30, 1911. Earle L. Ovington, with his *Queen* monoplane, was duly appointed an air mail carrier and covered a set route between the temporary post office established at the flying field and the post office at Mineola, N. Y., dropping the pouches at the latter point for the postmaster to pick up. This service, performed without expense to the department, was flown at regular intervals during the period, a total of 32,415 post cards, 3,993 letters, and 1,062 circulars being carried. It was quite satisfactory on the whole and very promising.

A few other similar experiments were made during the remainder of the year 1911, and the Post Office Department, recognizing the possibility of developing the airplane into a practicable means of aerial transportation, made recommendations to Congress early in 1912 for an appropriation of \$50,000 with which to start an experimental service, but Congress refused to grant the appropriation. Notwithstanding, the keen interest of the Post Office Department in aerial transportation was kept up and during the fiscal year 1912 a total of 31 orders, covering 16 different States, were issued, permitting mail to be carried on short exhibition and experimental flights between certain points. Such service was merely temporary, of course, but performed in each instance by a sworn carrier and without expense to the department. These experimental flights were continued, however, request being made on Congress for an air mail appropriation from year to year.

During the fiscal year 1916 funds were made available for the payment of airplane service out of the appropriation for steam-boat or other power-boat service, and in that year advertisements were issued inviting bids for service on one route in Massachusetts and on several in Alaska. No bids were received under the advertisements, due to the fact that possible bidders were unable to obtain suitably constructed planes for the proposed service. Nevertheless, negotiations with airplane manufacturers and other interested aviation activities were pushed forward, looking to the earliest possible establishment of a carefully conducted experimental air mail service. The development of the airplane in the World War and the important part it was then playing as a fighting factor in that great struggle also served to further strengthen the belief of postal officials that it certainly could be developed into a means of fast commercial and mail transportation as well. A final step looking toward this end was taken when Congress appropriated \$100,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, to be used in the establishment of an experimental air mail route.

Careful preliminary study and consideration had been given this new undertaking, and on May 15, 1918, the first air mail route in the United States was established between New York, N. Y., and Washington, D. C., with a stop at Philadelphia, Pa., for the exchange of mails or plane. The distance of the route was approximately 218 miles and the frequency of service was one round trip daily, except Sunday. This service was inaugurated with the cooperation of the War Department, which furnished the planes and pilots and conducted the flying and maintenance operations, the Post Office Department handling the mail and matters relating thereto. The cooperation of the War Department, which was of great value, was maintained until August 12, 1918, when the Post Office Department took over the entire operation of the route, furnishing its own equipment and personnel.

Flights on regular schedule, in all kinds of weather, presented new and unsolved problems, but gradually difficulties were overcome and a very reliable percentage of performance was attained over the route. In fact, the operation of this experimental route was so successful that the department immediately began to lay plans for the extension of the service, and with a view toward the possible establishment of a transcontinental route from New York City to San Francisco. The first leg of this important route was

established between Cleveland, Ohio, and Chicago, Ill., with a stop at Bryan, Ohio, on May 15, 1919, and the second leg, New York City to Cleveland, with a stop at Bellefonte, Pa., was established on July 1 of the same year.

These two latter routes were utilized to advance delivery of mail in connection with train service, and this was accomplished in the following manner. Chicago and Cleveland gateway mail was dispatched by plane from New York to Cleveland, where it was placed on trains that left New York the evening before, thus saving about 16 hours in time to the Middle West and 24 hours to the coast. Eastbound flights over this route advanced delivery of gateway mail from Cleveland to New York in the same manner. On the Cleveland-Chicago route mail from the East was taken from the train at Cleveland in the morning and flown to Chicago in time for the last city delivery, saving approximately 16 hours in time. On the eastbound trips mail was flown from Chicago to overtake the mail train at Cleveland, which reached New York at 9.40 the following morning, thereby effecting a saving in time of approximately 16 hours in the delivery of mail to New York City and the New England States.

On the three routes in operation during the fiscal year 1919 there were in the air daily eight planes, flying an aggregate of 1,906 miles each day. The record of performance during this fiscal year was 96.54 per cent, and this record was made with more than 30 per cent of the trips flown in rain, fog, mist, or other conditions of poor visibility.

On May 15, 1920, the third leg of the transcontinental route, Chicago, Ill., to Omaha, Nebr., via Iowa City, Iowa, was established, performing service similar to that performed on the routes between New York and Chicago. On August 16, 1920, a route was established between Chicago and St. Louis, and on December 1 of the same year a route was also established between Chicago and Minneapolis. Both of these latter routes expedited mail between the points named and were feeder lines to mail trains and the transcontinental route at Chicago.

The last leg of the transcontinental route, Omaha, Nebr., to San Francisco, Calif., via North Platte, Nebr.; Cheyenne, Rawlins, and Rock Springs, Wyo.; Salt Lake City, Utah; and Elko and Reno, Nev., was inaugurated on September 8, 1920. The initial westbound trip was made at the rate of 80 miles per hour and was flown without a forced landing, either for weather or mechanical trouble. The plane carried 16,000 letters, which arrived in San Francisco 22 hours ahead of the best possible time by train, had the train made all its connections.

Due to the necessity of economizing in expenditure, and the fact that Congress had not specifically authorized the same, the New York-Washington route was discontinued on May 31, 1921, and the Minneapolis-Chicago and the Chicago-St. Louis routes on June 30, 1921. Operation was then confined to the service between New York and San Francisco, for which appropriation was specifically made.

In order to further demonstrate the possibilities of the airplane as a factor in the transportation of the mail, arrangements were made for a through flight from San Francisco to New York, and on February 22, 1921, an air mail plane left San Francisco at 4.30 a. m., landing at New York (Hazelhurst Field, L. I., N. Y.) at 4.50 p. m., February 23. The total elapsed time for the trip, including all stops, was 33 hours and 21 minutes. The actual flying time was 25 hours and 16 minutes, and the average speed was 104 miles per hour over the entire distance of 2,629 miles. This flight was made possible by flying at night between Cheyenne, Wyo., and Chicago, Ill., a class of service the need of which was seen by the department. While the present relay service had been brought up to a high degree of perfection, yet it was apparent to the department that if the route could be operated from New York to San Francisco on a through schedule, flying both night and day, a wonderful stride in the development of air mail transportation would be accomplished.

With the development of night service in mind, the department on August 20, 1920, issued orders for the installation of radio stations at each field where this service could not be provided by Navy Department stations. By November 1, 10 of these stations were in operation, including 3 belonging to the Navy Department which were to be used in connection with the operation of the air mail service, and later on stations were established at all the remaining fields except Rawlins, Wyo., making a total of 17.

From this time on all plane movements were made on information as to weather conditions obtained by radio. In addition to service messages, it was used by other departments in lieu of telegraph when air mail traffic permitted, and was also of great service in transmitting weather forecasts and stock-market reports for the Department of Agriculture. In addition to the installation of radio stations, all the fields were being developed for night flying, and plans studied for the establishment of beacon lights between fields for the guidance of pilots.

When the service was inaugurated in 1918, Curtiss JN-4-H planes with Hispano-Suiza motors were used. Soon after the Post Office Department took over the details of operation in August of that year, a number of Standard Aircraft Co. mail planes were purchased. These were also equipped with Hispano-Suiza motors, and carried 200 pounds of mail. Rebuilt De Havilland planes with Liberty motors were largely used as the various legs of the transcontinental route were extended. However, at one time or another, planes of the following types were used somewhat extensively: Curtiss JN-4-H, with Wright engine, 150 horsepower; Standard JR-1B, with Wright engine, 150 horsepower;

Curtiss R-4-L, with Liberty-12 engine, 400 horsepower; Curtiss HA, with Liberty-12 engine; Twin D. H., with two Liberty-6 (Hall Scott) engines, 400 horsepower; Martin mail planes, with two Liberty-12 engines, 800 horsepower; Junker (JL-6), with B. M. W. engine, 200 horsepower; and L. W. F. (type V) with Isotta Fraschini 250 horsepower engines.

In the fiscal year 1921 the Post Office Department paid manufacturers \$476,109 for new planes and for remodeling of planes received from the Army. This practice was discontinued beginning with July 1, 1921, however, when the Air Mail Service adopted the De Havilland plane with Liberty 12 engine as standard equipment, disposing of all other types. A number of factors contributed to this end. Large stocks of Liberty motors were available and could be had by transfer from the War Department. With improvements made on the Liberty motor, such as heavy stub-tooth gears, drilled pistons, and improved oil pump, it could be considered as reliable and dependable as any motor of that time, if not more so. A number of De Havilland planes were also obtained from the War and Navy Departments, and when remodeled and rebuilt into mail planes they were speedy, reliable, long lived, and capable of carrying a mail load of 500 pounds. Experience had also proven they were a comparatively safe plane to operate. The air mail repair depot was located at Chicago and was used for repairing, remodeling, and rebuilding of planes, overhauling of motors, etc.

It might be stated here that when the service first began to use Liberty motors it was not an uncommon occurrence to have delayed and uncompleted trips due to motor trouble. However, by developing and perfecting rigid inspection, servicing, and overhaul methods actual forced landings on account of motor trouble became a rare occurrence. Due to this same system of inspection, forced landings on account of the failure of the plane or plane parts became almost unheard of.

During the spring and summer of 1923 work on a lighted airway between Cheyenne, Wyo., and Chicago, Ill., was being pushed forward with a view to carrying out certain experiments to determine whether cross-country night flying on regular schedule was possible, and whether a through transcontinental air mail service between New York and San Francisco could be regularly maintained. This was certainly a huge undertaking, as up to this time very little night flying had been done, and, of course, there were no lighted airways in existence. The United States Army Air Service had carried on some experiments and developed certain necessary equipment, but had attempted very little regular scheduled cross-country night flying. The Army obligingly placed at the disposal of the Post Office Department all the knowledge they had obtained from their experiments. Splendid cooperation was had at the hands of manufacturers of illuminating equipment of various kinds.

The General Electric Co., the American Gas Accumulator Co., and the Sperry Instrument Co. were particularly thorough in the assistance rendered. Beacon lights were installed between Chicago and Cheyenne, planes were equipped with landing lights, emergency fields were prepared, lighted and marked, and terminal fields lighted. Pilots were given an opportunity to make practice night flights. All arrangements were completed as planned, however, and in August, 1923, a regular schedule was flown between New York and San Francisco for a period of four days, that part of the route between Chicago and Cheyenne being flown at night. The best time eastbound on any of the four days was 26 hours and 14 minutes, and the best time westbound was 29 hours and 38 minutes. It may be stated, however, that better time can generally be made on eastbound trips, due to the fact that the prevailing winds are from the west. The result of the test was so satisfactory, being 100 per cent perfect, that operation of a transcontinental service on a similar schedule, the first 30 days to be a trial, was decided upon.

It was also decided to charge air mail postage at the rate of 8 cents an ounce for each zone transported, the route being divided into three zones, namely, New York to Chicago, Chicago to Cheyenne, and Cheyenne to San Francisco. Heretofore, no extra charge was made for the transportation of air mail, although when the service was first established back in 1918 special stamps were issued and the rate was 24 cents per ounce. This was later reduced to 16 cents per ounce, then to 6 cents, and due to lack of patronage was finally discontinued on July 18, 1919, the regular standard domestic rate of 2 cents per ounce being put into effect.

The remainder of 1923 and the first half of 1924 was spent in preparing for the inauguration of a regular transcontinental service, which was begun on July 1, 1924. The 30-day test was so satisfactory that the service was continued as a regular operation. The schedule required departure from the initial termini in the morning and arrival at the end of the route late in the afternoon of the next day.

Later on a considerable demand for an air mail service between New York and Chicago by a schedule which would deliver mail of one business day to the opposite termini in time for the first carrier delivery the next morning was evidenced, and to meet that demand an overnight service between these points was established on July 1, 1925.

A brief summary of the work done in connection with the inauguration of night flying will give some idea of the undertaking. In the last half of 1923 and the first half of 1924 the following special work was accomplished: 289 flashing gas beacons were installed between Chicago and Cheyenne; 34 emergency landing fields between the same points were rented, equipped with rotating electric beacons, boundary markers, and telephones; 5 terminal landing fields were equipped with beacons, floodlights, and

boundary markers; 17 planes were equipped with luminous instruments, navigation lights, landing lights, and parachute flares. In addition to this the necessary organization to handle operations both in the air and on the ground was brought up to a high degree of efficiency.

The running or navigation lights on the planes were similar to those used by ships at sea, only, of course, much smaller. A red light was installed on the left wing, a green one on the right wing, and a white one on the tail. The landing lights had projectors of the automobile type, but of much higher power. One light was mounted on the left wing tip and the other on the right, usually the lower panels. Each light gave approximately 150,000 beam candlepower. Two parachute flares were installed in each plane for emergency use. These could be released by the pilot if necessary to locate a field in case of forced landing at night, which occasionally happens. The flare when released gives a light of approximately 30,000 candlepower, burns from 4 to 7 minutes, and has a radius of illumination of approximately 1 mile at 1,000 feet altitude.

A 36-inch high-intensity arc revolving searchlight of approximately 500,000 candlepower was installed on a 50-foot tower at the regular fields. This great beacon, set at a fraction of a degree above the horizon, revolved at the rate of three times per minute and on clear nights could be seen by the pilots for a distance of 130 to 150 miles. An 18-inch rotating beacon of approximately 5,000 candlepower, mounted on top of a 50-foot windmill tower, was installed at each emergency field. This beacon was also set at a fraction of a degree above the horizon, revolved at the rate of six times a minute, and was visible to the pilots on clear nights from 60 to 75 miles. The lights from these powerful beacons guided the pilots in their lonely flights through the night and marked for them the emergency and regular landing fields. A large searchlight, similar to the 36-inch arc beacon, equipped with a lens which spread the light fan-shaped over the field, was used to illuminate the terminal fields for landing purposes. These flood lights were of great assistance and served to give the pilot as nearly as possible a daylight perspective when landing upon the field. One or two large, powerful B. B. T. flood lights were purchased for the beginning of regular night flying July 1, 1924, however, and eventually were installed at all terminal night-flying fields, replacing the above-mentioned 36-inch flood light.

The lens of the B. B. T. flood light, which throws a fan-shaped beam 180° in spread, is constructed and set in such a manner that no blinding effect is encountered by the pilot when landing on the field. It is rated at approximately 3,500,000 candlepower and will flood light an area practically 1 mile square. The emergency landing fields were located from 25 to 30 miles apart and furnished the pilot a safe place to land in case of necessity. The boundaries of both emergency and regular fields were outlined with small white lights placed 150 to 300 feet apart, and all obstacles were marked with red lights. Local electric current was available at terminal fields and was used to furnish power to the beacons and also through underground cable to the boundary lights. At emergency fields where local current was not available units composed of three or four primary cell batteries were used for boundary lighting, and Delco lighting plants were installed to furnish power for the rotating beacon. The plant was inclosed in a shack at the base of the tower, which also served as a shelter for the caretaker. As a matter of fact, caretaker shacks were provided at all emergency fields. The small A. G. A. gas beacons were located approximately every 3 miles in between the emergency and regular or terminal fields and served also to guide the pilot on the route. They flashed at the rate of 60 times a minute and received their light power from cylinders of acetylene gas, which were renewed about every five or six months. They flashed continually night and day at the start, but during the last few years of Government operation a sun valve was invented, which automatically shut off the light in the daytime and turned it on again at dusk.

The lighted airway was extended eastward from Chicago to Cleveland in the summer of 1924; westward to Rock Springs, Wyo., at the same time; from Cleveland to New York in the spring of 1925; and from Rock Springs to Salt Lake City in the fall of the same year. The last two extensions involved difficulties peculiar to the country over which laid out. The Cleveland-New York section traverses the Allegheny Mountain Range, offering serious difficulty in the establishment of emergency landing fields and locations of beacon lights on mountain tops that would be both visible to a pilot flying over and accessible from the ground. The section from Rock Springs to Salt Lake City traverses the Laramie and Wasatch Ranges of the Rocky Mountains, a stretch of country that is very sparsely settled. Many changes in the lighted airway were made to make it more efficient as time went on. Additional lights were installed, providing a powerful rotating beacon approximately every 15 miles; the 18-inch beacons were replaced with 24-inch beacons at practically all points, and one was also installed on top of the tower which supported the 36-inch beacon at the terminal fields, between Chicago and Cheyenne, thereby making it possible to limit the use of the 36-inch beacon to times when the weather was extremely bad. Emergency fields were improved and at a number of additional points local current was extended to the field. Experiment was made with wind-driven electric plants and several of them were successfully installed at points west of Chicago. These lighting plants, with power generated to large capacity storage batteries by a wind-driven propeller, were turned on at dusk and off at daylight by torque clocks or sunrelays, thus eliminating the expense of having a caretaker employed. A number of other fields where local current was available were also

made to be automatically controlled by the use of such instruments. The installation and illumination of this giant airway from New York City to Salt Lake City, a distance of some 2,045 miles, was accomplished at a cost of approximately \$542,000.

In view of the steady increase in mail loads, augmented by the establishment of several contract feeder routes in the early part of the year 1926, it became apparent to the department that a plane carrying a much larger load than the De Havilland was necessary. Competition among various aircraft manufacturers was invited and as a final result 51 Douglas mail planes were purchased, deliveries starting in the month of May, 1926. These new planes were capable of carrying more than twice the load carried by the De Havilland, and also had considerably more speed. As a matter of fact, trips between certain points were made at the rate of 150 to 160 or more miles per hour, but these were quite infrequent, however, and only when a stiff tail wind was in evidence. The record mail trip between Chicago and New York City was made on December 16, 1926, at the rate of 167.5 miles per hour. The fastest mail trip on record was made on January 30, 1927, between Chicago and Cleveland, at the rate of 175.1 miles per hour. The greater cruising radius and speed of the Douglas planes permitted the discontinuance, except possibly in adverse weather conditions, of stops in both directions at Bellefonte, Bryan, and Rawlins, and on eastbound trips at Iowa City, North Platte, and Rock Springs. An important change in the eastbound transcontinental schedule was also made possible, allowing 1 hour and 15 minutes later departure from the New York terminus. The new planes were put into use between Salt Lake City and New York City, where mail loads were heaviest, the De Havillands being used from Salt Lake City west. The building of De Havilland planes at the repair depot was discontinued on July 1, 1926, work of that nature being confined from then on to the repairing of old De Havillands and damaged Douglas planes. The surplus De Havilland planes released were advertised and sold.

An important step bearing on the development of air-mail traffic was taken by the department on February 1, 1927, when a new postage rate of 10 cents per half-ounce was put into effect, thereby entirely doing away with the complicated zoning system previously in use on the transcontinental and contract routes. The new flat rate entitled transportation between any points in the country, without regard to distance, and was a valuable means of increasing patronage.

The air mail service was awarded the Collier trophy for the most important contributions to the development of aeronautics in the year 1922 on its outstanding record of safety established, and again in the year 1923 for demonstrating the practicability of night flying. The Harmon trophy of the United States, offered for the first time in the year 1926, was awarded by the International League of Aviators to an air mail pilot because of his remarkable record of having flown during that year over 718 hours without accident, in all kinds of weather, both winter and summer, on regularly assigned trips, 47 per cent of the time being flown at night. It may be stated that in the award of the Harmon trophy the wonderful day-in-and-day-out flying record of the air mail pilot was considered more meritorious in the cause of advancing aviation than the flight made during that year by Commander Byrd over the North Pole.

It had never been the intention of the Post Office Department, however, to operate the air mail service longer than was necessary to clearly demonstrate the practicability of commercial aviation to the general public and thereby induce private enterprise to enter the field and eventually take over the operation of service. Due to the large measure of success attained in the efficient operation and development of the transcontinental route the desired interest was rapidly increasing, and in the year 1926 several contract air mail routes were put into operation and contracts on several more routes awarded. Interest in commercial aviation and contract air mail service in particular was further enlivened when in the spring of 1926 Congress passed a bill known as the air commerce act of 1926, which, briefly stated, imposed upon the Secretary of Commerce the duty of fostering the development of commercial aviation in the United States. It authorized the Secretary of Commerce, among other things, to designate and establish airways, in so far as funds were made available by Congress from year to year, and to establish, operate, and maintain along such airways all necessary lights and emergency landing fields.

It also provided that at such time as the Postmaster General and Secretary of Commerce by joint order should direct the airway under the jurisdiction and control of the Postmaster General, together with all emergency landing fields and other air facilities (except airports or terminal landing fields) used in connection therewith, would be transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary of Commerce, the established airports or terminal landing fields to be transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the municipalities concerned under arrangements subject to approval by the President. Taking all these happenings into consideration, the Postmaster General concluded that the time was fast approaching, or was actually at hand, when the transcontinental air mail route might be turned over to private contractors and operation successfully and profitably carried on by them.

In order to ascertain the response that would be made, advertisements were issued on November 15, 1926, to expire on January 15, 1927, for proposals for service on the transcontinental route by sections—(1) New York to Chicago and (2) Chicago to San Francisco. A proposal at a satisfactory rate was received on the Chicago to San Francisco section from the Boeing Airplane Co. &

Edward Hubbard, of Seattle, Wash. (later incorporated as the Boeing Air Transport, Salt Lake City, Utah), and accepted. Service began under their contract July 1, 1927, the Post Office Department relinquishing operation at midnight June 30. As no satisfactory bid was received for the service between New York and Chicago, that section of the route was readvertised under date of March 8 and the bid of the National Air Transport (Inc.), Chicago, Ill., accepted thereunder. This company began service under their contract on September 1, the Post Office Department continuing operation up until that time.

In addition to turning over to the contractor operation of service between Chicago and San Francisco on July 1, 1927, another important event in the history of the Government-operated air mail service took place on that date, when, acting under legislation contained in the air commerce act above referred to, the lighted airway and the radio service were transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Department of Commerce. The transfer of the radio service included 17 fully equipped stations, with an operating personnel of 44. Transfer of the lighted airway included an operating personnel of approximately 102 and the following fields and lights:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Emergency landing fields with caretakers in charge..... | 68 |
| Emergency landing fields automatically operated (no caretakers)..... | 21 |
| Electric beacon lights, in between emergency fields, with caretakers in charge..... | 21 |
| Electric beacon lights, in between emergency fields, automatically operated..... | 79 |
| A. G. A. gas routing beacons (automatic)..... | 405 |

Arrangements were made for the transfer of terminal airports to the municipalities at which they were located very shortly after the relinquishment of service on the western part of the route, and the same procedure was followed after relinquishment of service on the eastern part. The buildings at Chicago were located on property owned by the United States Veterans' Bureau and at Omaha and San Francisco on property owned by the War Department. Ownership of these buildings therefore reverted to the Government departments named.

A number of the new Douglas planes were sold to air mail contractors, and the balance, together with the few remaining serviceable De Havillands, were transferred to other Government departments in need of such equipment. Considerable of the shop material and equipment could be advantageously used in the large post-office garages and transfer was accordingly made. The remaining serviceable material, equipment, etc., was listed to the Chief Coordinator for clearance, and that desired by other Government departments was accordingly transferred. The material and equipment not taken by other branches of the Government was listed for sale and sold in the usual manner to the highest bidder. By December 31, 1927, the department's interests were completely closed out at all fields except Chicago, where only a small quantity of the material and equipment located in the repair depot and warehouse remained to be disposed of.

The Post Office Department has reason to be proud of the development of its undertaking, and the following tables will clearly illustrate some of the work accomplished from the beginning of service to its complete relinquishment August 31, 1927. From the statement on performance will be noted the remarkable percentage of scheduled miles flown, and in this connection it may be stated that if it were not for severe weather conditions, especially met with during the winter months of the year, such as fog, sleet, and blizzards, an almost perfect schedule could be maintained at all times. Of course, weather that it was considered impossible to fly through in the early stages was easily flown through during the last few years, but fog still remains the greatest enemy of the pilot and the cause of practically all serious delays and uncompleted trips. Short areas of fog are flown through or over, but it is not practicable to fly through or over large areas of dense fog, requiring designated landings to be made therein, with our present equipment and instruments. However, experiments are being continually carried on with a view to finding some effective means of overcoming this hazard, and it is hoped that such means will be found within the not too far distant future. Attention is also called to the wonderful record of safety established during the later years of operation, as shown in the statement of fatalities, etc. A total of 3,108,720 miles were flown before the last fatality occurred.

Statement of performance from the beginning to the end of Government-operated service May 15, 1918, to and including August 31, 1927

| Fiscal year ending June 30— | Miles mail trips scheduled | Miles mail trips actually flown | Percentage scheduled miles flown | Miles flown, ferry and test | Total miles flown, mail ferry and test | Forced landings (mail trips) | | Number letters carried (40 per pound) |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------------|---------|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | | | Mechanism | Weather | |
| 1918..... | 18,000 | 16,009 | 84 | 5,380 | 21,389 | 6 | 6 | 713,240 |
| 1919..... | 166,843 | 160,066 | 96 | 34,920 | 194,986 | 37 | 56 | 9,210,040 |
| 1920..... | 653,764 | 540,244 | 84 | 99,156 | 648,400 | 155 | 105 | 21,063,120 |
| 1921..... | 1,819,978 | 1,554,985 | 86 | 215,673 | 1,770,658 | 810 | 954 | 44,834,080 |
| 1922..... | 1,629,250 | 1,537,927 | 94 | 189,338 | 1,727,265 | 281 | 479 | 48,988,920 |
| 1923..... | 1,644,457 | 1,590,637 | 96 | 218,391 | 1,809,028 | 176 | 279 | 67,875,840 |
| 1924..... | 1,590,425 | 1,522,763 | 95 | 330,488 | 1,853,251 | 154 | 353 | 60,001,360 |
| 1925..... | 2,160,022 | 2,076,764 | 96 | 424,791 | 2,501,555 | 174 | 586 | 19,300,520 |
| 1926..... | 2,405,059 | 2,256,137 | 94 | 291,855 | 2,547,992 | 155 | 707 | 14,145,640 |
| 1927..... | 2,482,865 | 2,329,553 | 95 | 253,453 | 2,583,006 | 140 | 881 | 22,385,000 |
| 1928 ¹ | 179,304 | 173,987 | 97 | 21,725 | 195,712 | 7 | 31 | 3,338,080 |
| Total..... | 14,749,967 | 13,768,072 | 93 | 2,085,170 | 15,853,242 | 2,095 | 4,437 | 301,855,840 |

¹ Only mail with postage prepaid at the higher or special air mail rate was carried in 1925, 1926, 1927, and 1928.

² Operated by the Post Office Department between New York and Chicago only during the months of July and August, 1928.

Statement of fatalities, injuries, and plane crashes from the beginning to the end of Government-operated service, May 15, 1918, to and including August 31, 1927

| Fiscal year | Number of fatalities | | Average miles flown for each fatality | Number injured | | | Planes crashed | Average miles flown per crash |
|-------------|----------------------|-------|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| | Class | Total | | Minor | Serious | | | |
| | | | | | Flight | Ground | | |
| 1918..... | | | (¹) | | | | | |
| 1919..... | | 3 | 64,995 | 2 | 1 | | 13 | 14,999 |
| | Pilots..... | 2 | 97,493 | | | | | |
| | On ground..... | 1 | 194,986 | | | | | |
| 1920..... | | 9 | 72,044 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 33 | 19,648 |
| | Pilots..... | 5 | 129,680 | | | | | |
| | Passengers..... | 4 | 162,100 | | | | | |
| 1921..... | | 17 | 104,156 | | | | | |
| | Pilots..... | 12 | 147,554 | 33 | 1 | 2 | 56 | 31,618 |
| | Passengers..... | 4 | 442,664 | | | | | |
| | On ground..... | 1 | 1,770,658 | | | | | |
| 1922..... | Pilot..... | 1 | 1,727,265 | 35 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 101,604 |
| 1923..... | | 4 | 452,157 | 27 | | 2 | 12 | 150,752 |

¹ No fatality.

Statement of fatalities, injuries, and plane crashes from the beginning to the end of Government-operated service, May 15, 1918, to and including August 31, 1927—Continued

| Fiscal year | Number of fatalities | | Average miles flown for each fatality | Number injured | | | Planes crashed | Average miles flown per crash |
|-------------|----------------------|-------|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| | Class | Total | | Minor | Serious | | | |
| | | | | | Flight | Ground | | |
| 1923 | Pilots | 3 | 603,009 | | | | | |
| | Passenger | 1 | 1,809,028 | | | | | |
| 1924 | Pilots | 4 | 463,312 | 41 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 132,375 |
| 1925 | do | 2 | 1,250,777 | 46 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 208,463 |
| 1926 | do | 2 | 1,273,996 | 59 | 2 | | 9 | 283,111 |
| 1927 | Pilot | 1 | 2,583,006 | 51 | 2 | 9 | 33 | 78,272 |
| 1928 | | | (1) | 4 | | | 1 | 195,712 |
| Total | (2) | 43 | (3) | 308 | 11 | 25 | 200 | 79,266 |

¹ No fatality.

² 32 fatal crashes; 32 pilots and 9 employees who accompanied pilots on flights killed; 2 employees killed on ground by propellers.

³ Average miles flown for each fatal crash, 495,414; average miles flown for each employee killed in flight, 386,665; average miles flown for each fatality (flight and ground), 368,680.

During the period between the last fatality, Apr. 22, 1927, and the previous one, Feb. 12, 1926, a total of 3,108,720 miles were flown.

Statement showing appropriations and expenditures for operation and maintenance of the air mail service from the beginning to the end of Government-operated service, May 15, 1918, to and including August 31, 1927

| Fiscal year | Air mail appropriation | Total amount expended | How expended | | | | | Value of property inventory at close of year |
|-------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--|
| | | | Wages and salaries | Pilots mileage pay | Building and field improvements | Gasoline and oil | Other supplies and service | |
| 1918..... | \$100,000 | \$13,604 | | | | | | |
| 1919..... | 100,000 | 717,177 | | | | | | |
| 1920..... | 850,000 | 1,264,495 | | | | | | |
| 1921..... | 1,375,000 | 2,653,882 | | | | | | |
| 1922..... | 1,425,000 | 1,418,146 | \$548,101 | \$92,891 | \$29,222 | \$181,204 | \$563,749 | \$2,560,018 |
| 1923..... | 1,900,000 | 1,897,151 | 676,945 | 101,327 | 473,796 | 183,360 | 458,723 | 2,861,492 |
| 1924..... | 1,500,000 | 1,498,674 | 759,304 | 107,739 | 32,336 | 160,081 | 436,536 | 3,246,385 |
| 1925..... | 2,750,000 | 2,743,750 | 1,059,384 | 174,743 | 163,707 | 226,998 | 1,118,918 | 3,506,534 |
| 1926..... | 2,885,000 | 2,782,422 | 1,180,595 | 197,496 | 294,298 | 232,733 | 877,295 | 3,816,679 |
| 1927..... | 2,650,000 | 2,255,919 | 991,528 | 205,180 | 24,655 | 201,255 | 833,301 | 3,345,641 |
| 1928..... | 2,150,000 | 166,314 | 121,137 | 16,707 | None | 11,453 | 17,017 | (1) |
| Total..... | 17,685,000 | 17,411,534 | | | | | | |

¹ No property.

In the fiscal years 1919, 1920, and 1921 appropriations made for star-route, powerboat, and railroad service were used by the air mail service.

The records for the fiscal years 1918 to 1921, inclusive, were so kept that it would be difficult to itemize the expenditures.

An inventory was not taken until the close of the fiscal year 1922.

Statement showing pilots in service at discontinuance of Government-operated route, with dates of their original appointment, and total number of miles and hours flown

| Pilot | Date of original appointment in service | Date of last flight | Total number of hours flown | Total number of miles flown |
|-------------------------|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Allen, Edmond..... | July 10, 1925 | June 29, 1927 | 1,126.34 | 109,669 |
| Allison, Ernest M..... | Aug. 23, 1920 | June 27, 1927 | 3,806.16 | 359,793 |
| Barker, Hugh..... | Jan. 4, 1924 | June 13, 1927 | 1,794.22 | 170,073 |
| Barnes, J. M..... | Aug. 24, 1924 | July 14, 1927 | 1,452.02 | 139,458 |
| Bertaud, Lloyd W..... | Nov. 16, 1924 | July 2, 1927 | 1,443.19 | 141,806 |
| Biffle, Ira O..... | Dec. 9, 1918 | June 28, 1927 | 1,902.37 | 193,515 |
| Boonstra, Harry G..... | Mar. 14, 1921 | June 27, 1927 | 3,238.49 | 303,428 |
| Bowen, L. L..... | July 10, 1925 | Apr. 5, 1927 | 946.07 | 93,949 |
| Brown, Henry J..... | Jan. 12, 1925 | Aug. 31, 1927 | 1,425.17 | 151,166 |
| Burnside, Frank H..... | July 17, 1923 | do..... | 1,479.10 | 147,885 |
| Chandler, Harry A..... | Aug. 16, 1920 | Aug. 30, 1927 | 4,132.22 | 394,605 |
| Collins, Paul F..... | Feb. 12, 1921 | Aug. 31, 1927 | 3,587.00 | 361,689 |
| Collison, H. A..... | May 27, 1921 | June 19, 1927 | 3,482.17 | 331,474 |
| Ellis, Robert H..... | July 7, 1919 | June 28, 1927 | 3,388.02 | 347,518 |
| Hill, James D..... | July 1, 1924 | July 11, 1927 | 1,928.36 | 202,027 |
| Hopson, William C..... | Apr. 14, 1920 | Aug. 27, 1927 | 4,043.25 | 413,034 |
| Huking, Harry..... | May 3, 1920 | June 30, 1927 | 2,509.17 | 226,850 |
| Johnson, C. Eugene..... | Mar. 10, 1921 | June 8, 1927 | 2,525.28 | 239,356 |
| Johnson, Ralph J..... | Aug. 25, 1924 | June 26, 1927 | 1,492.00 | 140,520 |
| Kaufman, Stephen T..... | July 1, 1925 | Aug. 31, 1927 | 1,503.51 | 149,040 |
| Knight, James H..... | June 25, 1919 | June 30, 1927 | 4,282.54 | 417,072 |
| Lee, Eber H..... | Dec. 29, 1918 | June 28, 1927 | 4,220.43 | 382,426 |
| Levisse, Rexford B..... | Nov. 9, 1920 | June 30, 1927 | 3,365.25 | 320,889 |
| Lewis, Harold T..... | May 27, 1919 | June 29, 1927 | 3,840.21 | 365,625 |
| McGinn, Leo J..... | May 10, 1923 | Aug. 31, 1927 | 593.58 | 60,937 |
| Maroney, Edward S..... | Aug. 11, 1921 | June 30, 1927 | 3,775.09 | 35,527 |
| Marshall, Tex..... | Sept. 21, 1920 | June 22, 1927 | 3,675.08 | 329,152 |
| Mouton, E. E..... | Sept. 8, 1920 | May 22, 1927 | 3,805.54 | 369,730 |
| Murray, James P..... | June 8, 1920 | July 11, 1927 | 4,380.46 | 400,611 |
| Myers, Geo. L..... | June 1, 1923 | Sept. 9, 1927 | 2,782.29 | 281,114 |
| Pomeroy, Geo. W..... | Aug. 16, 1924 | Aug. 4, 1927 | 1,049.24 | 155,123 |
| Sharpnack, J. C..... | Sept. 8, 1920 | June 9, 1927 | 2,256.41 | 217,212 |
| Short, Shirley J..... | Mar. 2, 1923 | Aug. 31, 1927 | 2,841.43 | 284,552 |
| Smith, Dean C..... | May 21, 1920 | Aug. 28, 1927 | 3,764.57 | 365,719 |
| Smith, Harry G..... | Aug. 31, 1920 | Aug. 29, 1927 | 2,770.11 | 265,164 |
| Smith, W. L..... | Nov. 8, 1919 | June 15, 1927 | 4,029.26 | 391,686 |

PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS (INC.)

Foreign air mail closings and rates to all Latin American countries directly connected by United States domestic air mail lines

Consult your postmaster for closing days and hour at your postal box for air mail destined to the country in which you are interested. Mail early. Insure connections at Miami or Brownsville. Absolute final closings quoted below from Washington. "The main post office" indicates post office at Union Station]

| Country | Rate from any city in United States of America | Mail closing days | Closing hours at— | | Due destination |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | The main post office | Your post-office box | |
| Argentina..... | 55 cents each one-half ounce..... | Monday and Thursdays..... | 10.45 p. m..... | 6.30 p. m..... | Mondays and Thursdays. |
| Brazil, Bahia..... | 50 cents each one-half ounce..... | Saturdays..... | do..... | do..... | Saturdays. |
| Brazil, Natal..... | do..... | do..... | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| Brazil, Para..... | do..... | do..... | do..... | do..... | Thursdays. |
| Brazil, Rio de Janeiro..... | do..... | do..... | do..... | do..... | Sundays. |
| Brazil, Santos and Sao Paulo..... | do..... | do..... | do..... | do..... | Mondays. |
| British Guiana..... | 30 cents each one-half ounce..... | do..... | do..... | do..... | Wednesdays. |
| British Honduras..... | 15 cents each one-half ounce..... | Wednesdays and Fridays..... | do..... | do..... | Fridays and Sundays. |
| Canal Zone..... | 20 cents each one-half ounce..... | Monday and Thursdays..... | do..... | do..... | Wednesdays and Saturdays. |
| Do..... | do..... | Fridays..... | do..... | do..... | Mondays. |
| Chile, Arica..... | 50 cents each one-half ounce..... | Monday and Thursdays..... | do..... | do..... | Saturdays and Tuesdays. |
| Chile, Santiago..... | do..... | do..... | do..... | do..... | Sundays and Wednesdays. |

¹ Mail 1 day sooner during winter months.

Statement showing pilots in service at discontinuance of Government-operated route, with dates of their original appointment, and total number of miles and hours flown—Continued

| Pilot | Date of original appointment in service | Date of last flight | Total number of hours flown | Total number of miles flown |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Vance, C. K..... | Apr. 22, 1920 | June 30, 1927 | 2,811.58 | 268,094 |
| Wagner, R. L..... | Apr. 23, 1923 | do..... | 2,345.24 | 235,551 |
| Ward, Earl F..... | Dec. 21, 1923 | Aug. 31, 1927 | 2,166.08 | 229,722 |
| Webster, J. O..... | Jan. 3, 1921 | do..... | 1,444.24 | 132,986 |
| Williams, W. D..... | Aug. 10, 1920 | Aug. 29, 1927 | 4,336.05 | 424,294 |
| Winslow, B. H..... | Sept. 22, 1920 | June 30, 1927 | 2,885.57 | 256,553 |
| Yager, F. R..... | Aug. 10, 1920 | June 27, 1927 | 4,009.14 | 391,616 |

Mr. ACKERMAN. The United States started its air mail service in 1918. From then until September, 1927, when this service was converted to contract carriers, the total cost of it to the Government was \$17,411,534.

I think it will be useful to have in the RECORD a short table showing the annual appropriations and expenditures while this service was conducted by the Post Office Department.

Statement showing appropriations and expenditures for Government-operated and contract air mail service

| Fiscal year | Air mail appropriation | | Expenditures | |
|-------------|--|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| | Government operated; began May 15, 1918, ended Aug. 31, 1927 | Contract began Feb. 15, 1926 | Government operated; began May 15, 1918, ended Aug. 31, 1927 | Contract began Feb. 15, 1926 |
| 1918..... | \$100,000.00 | | \$13,604.00 | |
| 1919..... | 100,000.00 | | 717,177.00 | |
| 1920..... | 850,000.00 | | 1,264,495.00 | |
| 1921..... | 1,375,000.00 | | 2,653,882.00 | |
| 1922..... | 1,425,000.00 | | 1,418,146.00 | |
| 1923..... | 1,900,000.00 | | 1,897,151.00 | |
| 1924..... | 1,500,000.00 | | 1,498,674.00 | |
| 1925..... | 2,750,000.00 | | 2,743,750.00 | |
| 1926..... | 2,885,000.00 | \$500,000.00 | 2,782,422.00 | \$101,891.32 |
| 1927..... | 2,650,000.00 | 2,000,000.00 | 2,255,919.00 | 1,374,217.23 |
| 1928..... | 2,150,000.00 | 4,500,000.00 | 166,314.00 | 4,057,608.40 |
| 1929..... | | 12,430,000.00 | | 11,207,967.54 |
| 1930..... | | 15,000,000.00 | | 14,670,476.98 |
| Total..... | 17,685,000.00 | 34,430,000.00 | 17,411,534.00 | 31,412,161.47 |

Appropriations for star route, power boat, and railroad service were used.

It is very wonderful to read how time is lessened by the use of the airplane facilities, even though the cost is somewhat higher than by ordinary post, between the United States and the various countries in South and Central America. For instance, by airplane it takes but 7 days to Argentina as against 18 days by steamer; to Brazil, 7 days as against 15 days by steamer; to Chile, 5 days as against 17 days by steamer; the Guianas, 4 days by airplane as against 13 by steamer; to Uruguay, 7 days by airplane as against 17 by steamer.

I will not read the other points of destination, but will insert them in my remarks, believing they constitute useful information and as indicative of the great facilities available to American exporters in the handling of Central and South American business.

PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS (INC.)—continued

Foreign air mail closings and rates to all Latin American countries directly connected by United States domestic air mail lines

Consult your postmaster for closing days and hour at your postal box for air mail destined to the country in which you are interested. Mail early. Insure connections at Miami or Brownsville. Absolute final closings quoted below from Washington. "The main post office" indicates post office at Union Station]

| Country | Rate from any city in United State of America | Mail closing days ¹ | Closing hours at— | | Due destination |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | | | The main post office | Your post-office box | |
| Colombia, Barranquilla | 30 cents each one-half ounce. | Mondays | 10.45 p. m. | 6.30 p. m. | Thursdays. |
| Colombia, Buenaventura | do | Mondays and Thursdays | do | do | Thursdays and Sundays. |
| Costa Rica | 20 cents each one-half ounce. | Wednesdays and Fridays | do | do | Saturdays and Mondays. |
| Cuba | 5 cents each one-half ounce. | Daily | do | do | Daily. |
| Curacao | 30 cents each one-half ounce. | Mondays | do | do | Fridays. |
| Dominican Republic | 10 cents each one-half ounce. | Saturdays, Mondays, and Wednesdays | do | do | Monday, Wednesdays, and Fridays. |
| Dutch Guiana | 30 cents each one-half ounce. | Saturdays | do | do | Wednesdays. |
| Ecuador | do | Mondays and Thursdays | do | do | Thursdays and Sundays. |
| French Guiana | do | Saturdays | do | do | Thursdays. |
| Guatemala | 15 cents each one-half ounce. | Fridays, Sundays, and Wednesdays | 6.40 a. m. | 1 a. m. | Sundays, Tuesdays, and Fridays. |
| Haiti | 10 cents each one-half ounce. | Saturdays, Mondays, and Wednesdays | 10.45 p. m. | 6.30 p. m. | Monday, Wednesdays, and Fridays. |
| Honduras, Tela | 15 cents each one-half ounce. | Wednesdays and Fridays | do | do | Fridays and Sundays. |
| Honduras, San Lorenzo | do | Wednesdays, Fridays, and Sundays | 6.40 a. m. | 1 a. m. | Saturdays, Mondays, and Wednesdays. |
| Lesser Antilles | 20 cents each one-half ounce. | Saturdays | 10.45 p. m. | 6.30 p. m. | Tuesdays. |
| Mexico, Mexico City | 5 cents first ounce and 10 cents each additional ounce. | Daily | do | do | Daily. |
| Mexico, Tampico | do | do | do | do | do |
| Mexico, Vera Cruz | do | Fridays, Sundays, and Wednesdays | 6.40 a. m. | 1 a. m. | Sundays, Tuesdays, and Fridays. |
| Nassau | 5 cents each one-half ounce. | Tuesdays | 10.45 p. m. | 6.30 p. m. | Wednesdays. |
| Nicaragua, Managua | 15 cents each one-half ounce. | Wednesdays and Fridays | do | do | Saturdays and Mondays. |
| Nicaragua, Puerto Cabezas | do | Mondays and Thursdays | do | do | Wednesdays and Saturdays. |
| Panama, Republic of | 20 cents each one-half ounce. | do | do | do | do |
| Peru, Lima | 40 cents each one-half ounce. | do | do | do | Fridays and Mondays. |
| Peru, Tacna | do | do | do | do | Saturdays and Tuesdays. |
| Porto Rico | 10 cents each one-half ounce. | Saturdays, Mondays, and Wednesdays | do | do | Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays. |
| Salvador (via Brownsville) | 15 cents each one-half ounce. | Fridays, Sundays, and Wednesdays | 6.40 a. m. | 1 a. m. | Sundays, Tuesdays, and Fridays. |
| Salvador (via Miami) | do | Wednesdays and Fridays | 10.45 p. m. | 6.30 p. m. | Fridays and Sundays. |
| Trinidad | 20 cents each one-half ounce. | Saturdays | do | do | Tuesdays. |
| Uruguay | 55 cents each one-half ounce. | Mondays and Thursdays | do | do | Monday and Thursdays. |
| Venezuela, Caracas | 30 cents each one-half ounce. | Mondays | do | do | Fridays. |
| Venezuela, Maracaibo | do | do | do | do | Thursdays. |
| Virgin Islands | 10 cents each one-half ounce. | Saturdays | do | do | Tuesdays. |

Schedule subject to change without notice. The United States Post Office Department requires that the correct amount of postage be affixed to each article to be sent by air mail to the above countries. Carelessness in this matter may cause serious delay to your mail.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the thorough study which the gentleman has made of this subject, can he inform the House as to the rates of postage on this apparently non-compensatory service, where we appropriated in the Post Office bill of this year \$7,000,000 for services which show revenues of only \$330,000?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I will say that I have not been able to go into that matter into the detail that the gentleman would like, I am sure, but I simply know about the cost per ounce. The matter of contracts is one that belongs to the Post Office Department and I have not attempted to examine into that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the cost not run about \$20 a pound?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not concerned about the cost. I am asking what the rate of postage is to obtain this highly subsidized service.

Mr. ACKERMAN. I have the rates to all of these southern countries, but it would take too much of my time. If I insert them in my remarks it will give the information which the gentleman desires.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wanted it more for Argentina and Brazil.

Mr. ACKERMAN. It is 55 cents per half-ounce to Argentine; it is 50 cents per half-ounce to Brazil; it is 20 cents per half ounce to Costa Rica; 50 cents a half ounce to Chile; it is 20 cents per half ounce to the Lesser Antilles; it is 40 cents per half ounce to Lima, Peru; it is 55 cents per half ounce to Uruguay, and 30 cents per half ounce to Venezuela.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Do I understand that the total revenue derived from the air mail only aggregates about \$300,000?

Mr. ACKERMAN. It is a smaller amount as compared with the amount we have already expended, but it has opened up these countries to the commerce of the United States in a remarkable degree.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I appreciate that fact.

Mr. ACKERMAN. The Foreign and Domestic Bureau, realizing that it was somewhat on trial during the past year, expedited the gathering and distribution of facts and figures, increasing its cable service on conditions abroad by 25 per cent and strengthening all of its statistical and informational services, and on behalf of domestic commerce it rushed to completion those researches which could be hurried.

Requests upon the bureau were a thousand a day more than in the preceding year. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, there was an increase of 7 per cent in the bureau's appropriation, the total being \$4,906,323 against \$4,603,357 for 1928-29, which was matched by a 9 per cent in the number of services (3,631,558 against 3,343,118) rendered by the bureau in the previous year. Evidence of the practical value of the assistance offered is shown in the 9 per cent gain in known new foreign business and savings for which the bureau was given credit by a number of firms. During 1928-29 out of 22,298 firms served 1,021 reported new business of \$42,651,854, while for 1929-30, 1,835 out of 24,986 served reported a total of \$50,754,545.42.

Without reading I shall insert in the RECORD a table showing all the services rendered from the time the appropriation was \$1,211,000 in 1921-22, when it cost \$2.38 per service, down to the period of 1929-30, when 3,631,558 services were rendered and the appropriation was \$4,539,923 and the cost of the service was reduced to \$1.25. I have had this segregated into the various countries, to Europe, Latin America, the district offices, and so on, so that when it appears in the RECORD anyone so desiring can find out just exactly where these services were rendered.

Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—Services rendered

| Fiscal year | Services rendered | Appropriation | Cost per service |
|--------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| 1921-22..... | 505,661 | \$1,211,010 | \$2.38 |
| 1922-23..... | 881,521 | 1,693,585 | 1.92 |
| 1923-24..... | 1,168,972 | 2,567,610 | 2.19 |
| 1924-25..... | 2,041,250 | 2,835,303 | 1.39 |
| 1925-26..... | 2,032,825 | 2,994,064 | 1.47 |
| 1926-27..... | 2,421,563 | 3,263,357 | 1.35 |
| 1927-28..... | 2,770,773 | 3,721,957 | 1.34 |
| 1928-29..... | 3,342,118 | 4,257,357 | 1.27 |
| 1929-30..... | 3,631,558 | 4,539,923 | 1.25 |

| Services rendered under | 1928-29 | 1929-30 | Per cent increase |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|
| European offices..... | 1,155,788 | 1,182,833 | 2.3 |
| Latin American offices..... | 803,155 | 866,270 | 7.8 |
| District offices..... | 2,944,890 | 3,214,278 | 9 |
| Commodity divisions..... | 1,954,313 | 2,203,341 | 12.8 |
| Domestic commerce..... | 265,375 | 441,719 | 66 |
| Trade restrictions..... | 121,893 | 148,911 | 20 |
| Trade statistics..... | 77,367 | 114,766 | 48 |
| Foreign buyers: | | | |
| Trade lists..... | 690,372 | 740,823 | 7 |
| Trade opportunities..... | 885,243 | 915,058 | 3.3 |
| Total services..... | 3,342,118 | 4,539,923 | 8.6 |
| Total appropriation..... | 4,257,357 | 4,539,923 | 6.2 |

DOLLARS AND CENTS RESULTS

| Fiscal year | Firms served | Firms reporting | Amount reported |
|---------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1929-30..... | 24,986 | 1,835 | \$50,754,545.42 |
| 1928-29..... | 22,298 | 1,021 | 42,651,854.00 |
| Increase..... | 2,688 | 814 | 8,102,691.42 |
| Per cent of increase..... | 12.1 | 79.7 | 18.9 |

¹ The itemized services add up to more than the figures given as total services for each year. This is because more than one of our units may have rendered service on a particular request.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. KNUTSON. About what has our foreign commerce increased in the period the gentleman just mentioned?

Mr. ACKERMAN. It has somewhat decreased. It has decreased like other countries have decreased.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, over a 10-year period.

Mr. ACKERMAN. I have that a little later on very much in detail.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Has the gentleman any information which will show us whether our trade has increased or decreased with South American countries and, if so, to what extent?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Not in detail. I have it as regards the larger items of Europe—Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Germany, and France. That I shall come to a little later.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman have anything on South America?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Not in detail.

DOMESTIC COMMERCE ACTIVITIES

The greatest increase in the number of services rendered by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce was that in connection with domestic commerce. That bureau received 441,719 requests for aid on domestic trade problems during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1930, as compared with 265,375 requests during the preceding fiscal year—an increase of 66 per cent. This increase in work was performed despite the fact that the appropriations had not been increased proportionately.

The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, with its facilities, endeavored to make a scientific study of distribution methods and costs. A roughly estimated average division of expenses for all industry in the United States tells us production costs are 55 per cent and distribution costs 45 per cent of the total cost of doing business in this country. During the past 50 years the United States has

made great strides in the field of production costs, but very little attention has been paid to distribution costs. Thoughtful industrial leaders and observers finally have arrived at a more or less unanimous agreement that the study of distribution methods has lagged far behind the urgent needs of the day.

The estimated annual loss through wasteful and inefficient methods of distributing manufactured goods is \$10,000,000,000. This prorates \$85 per capita, and is actually being paid out every year by all consumers of goods in the prices they must pay for the goods they must buy. This mountain of waste represents nearly the entire net income of all taxpayers in this country who earn less than \$10,000 a year, and three hundred times greater than total income taxes paid to Government in 1927 by those same taxpayers.

I have a breakdown of those figures and will insert them in my extension of remarks.

Number individual income-tax returns up to \$10,000:

1927..... 3,755,650

1928..... 3,688,730

Total net income up to \$10,000:

1927..... \$12,376,657,051

1928..... \$12,552,885,970

Total tax paid income classes up to \$10,000:

1927..... \$32,416,729

1928..... \$36,297,355

Source: Statistics of Income for 1928, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Treasury Department.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What did I understand the figure to be in regard to loss?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Ten billions a year. That is what the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce informs me. I shall insert by years what the domestic commerce appropriations were. The appropriations at the present time are in the neighborhood of \$400,000.

In this connection, let me call your attention just for a moment to what I think is a rather remarkable occurrence. The Harvard graduate school of business administration at Harvard University, I understand, awards a prize annually for the best method of research. After some 35 or 40 very meritorious methods were presented for their consideration, some one in 1929 said, "If we had something here like the handbook on foreign and domestic commerce—they call it 'The Market Data Handbook'—we would like to have it entered as a competitor."

They said, "We have one here," and it was entered informally, you might say, and Mr. Paul W. Stewart, of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, was awarded the highest prize for that year for the Market Data Handbook of the United States. Of that publication some 16,000 copies have been sold.

It is a regular encyclopedia of information regarding trade throughout the United States and the bureau sells it for but \$2.50, very much less than its cost, but it is a very useful vade mecum for everyone who is interested in commerce.

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. YON. The gentleman is discussing the Department of Commerce, I believe?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes.

Mr. YON. I have had many inquiries lately about range lights along the coast. I notice in the committee's report the following language:

Aids to navigation, establishing public works, including \$70,000 for 1931 in the deficiency act.

And that the committee has included \$30,000 less than the Budget estimate. I am particularly interested in aids to navigation, and I would like to know whether the committee felt sufficient money was appropriated for this item by giving less than \$30,000 than the Budget estimate?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I will frankly say to the gentleman from Florida that I have not gone into that matter very fully, and I would like to refer that inquiry to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. SHREVE. The answer is this: That item has been reduced because it was felt they could get along with the amount appropriated, and the reduction will not in any way affect aids to navigation.

Mr. YON. I am asking these questions because the Director of the Lighthouse Service has written me just recently that they did not have money enough to place range lights along the coast.

Mr. SHREVE. This appropriation does not begin until the end of this fiscal year, and it is for the next year. I think the gentleman will find they had enough for this year.

Mr. YON. Does the gentleman believe they will have enough money to carry on the necessary work in connection with aids to navigation?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes. If the gentleman will refer to page 25 of our report he will find a discussion of the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

Mr. ACKERMAN. I thank the chairman.

I will insert as an extension of my remarks the amount of business done by each State during 1927, 1928, and 1929, which may be useful for reference purposes, and I may say that, at the request of some of the members of the committee, I am also inserting a list of the places where the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce maintains local offices and also where they have cooperative offices, together with the number of firms reporting and the amount of orders that they have stated they received, and the average amount for each firm reporting from each district office.

Herewith are the latest available figures of exports by States:

Total exports of merchandise from the United States in 1929 were valued at \$5,157,083,027, compared with \$5,043,973,142 for 1928, an increase of \$113,109,885.

The first 10 States in order of value of exports during the 12 months were New York, with foreign shipments valued at \$956,755,282; Texas, \$657,559,600; California, \$377,392,437; Michigan, \$355,300,020; Pennsylvania, \$340,843,339; Illinois, \$321,776,759; New Jersey, \$262,699,217; Ohio, \$221,916,976; Louisiana, \$221,272,346; and Washington, \$126,744,522.

Thirty-one States and the District of Columbia increased the value of their exports compared with 1928. New York, with an increase of \$95,176,358, registered the largest gain over the preceding year and was followed in order by Pennsylvania, \$48,756,098; New Jersey, \$41,168,348; Illinois, \$32,407,211; California, \$31,955,779; Arkansas, \$7,426,134; North Carolina, \$30,860,810; Ohio, \$25,398,588; Alabama, \$13,343,199; Indiana, \$12,779,266; Missouri, \$9,925,619; Mississippi, \$8,100,003; Connecticut, \$5,521,144; Oklahoma, \$5,327,837; Washington, \$5,106,390; Iowa, \$5,096,139; South Carolina, \$4,986,224; Florida, \$4,765,726; Kentucky, \$3,654,213; Tennessee, \$2,967,846; Rhode Island, \$2,465,123; Delaware, \$1,792,992; Nebraska, \$1,638,017; Maine, \$1,442,303; Arizona, \$1,332,924; South Dakota, \$955,105; Oregon, \$36,393; Colorado, \$581,953; Nevada, \$127,578; Washington, D. C. \$421,578; Utah, \$359,259; and New Hampshire, \$183,290.

Domestic exports from the United States by States from which shipped during the calendar year 1929, arranged according to magnitude, with comparative figures for 1928 and 1927

| State | 1929 | 1928 | 1927 |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1. New York | \$956,755,282 | \$861,578,924 | \$769,766,896 |
| 2. Texas | 657,559,600 | 817,001,082 | 647,026,141 |
| 3. California | 377,392,437 | 345,436,658 | 309,544,746 |
| 4. Michigan | 355,300,020 | 367,253,146 | 326,879,584 |
| 5. Pennsylvania | 340,843,339 | 292,087,241 | 290,497,974 |
| 6. Illinois | 321,776,759 | 206,355,671 | 208,045,111 |
| 7. New Jersey | 262,699,217 | 221,530,869 | 232,779,892 |
| 8. Ohio | 221,916,976 | 196,518,388 | 186,091,545 |
| 9. Louisiana | 221,272,346 | 235,467,286 | 229,304,962 |
| 10. Washington | 126,744,522 | 121,638,132 | 107,646,440 |
| 11. Wisconsin | 124,977,467 | 137,861,141 | 127,101,600 |
| 12. Massachusetts | 111,531,026 | 123,128,927 | 116,365,275 |
| 13. Virginia | 101,135,071 | 142,504,115 | 136,416,741 |
| 14. North Carolina | 99,524,789 | 68,663,979 | 60,459,126 |
| 15. Indiana | 73,740,468 | 60,961,202 | 62,983,454 |
| 16. Georgia | 70,935,462 | 73,142,913 | 105,646,330 |
| 17. Oregon | 70,208,381 | 69,271,988 | 64,213,262 |
| 18. Maryland | 67,886,681 | 71,916,817 | 73,879,643 |
| 19. Alabama | 59,236,701 | 45,893,507 | 47,049,193 |
| 20. Connecticut | 53,817,912 | 47,796,768 | 48,900,735 |
| 21. Mississippi | 52,882,538 | 44,782,555 | 57,146,645 |
| 22. Tennessee | 52,135,646 | 49,167,800 | 43,030,302 |
| 23. Minnesota | 51,649,147 | 76,035,274 | 105,418,088 |
| 24. Missouri | 49,296,315 | 39,370,696 | 39,800,427 |
| 25. West Virginia | 41,289,873 | 43,200,772 | 53,215,791 |
| 26. Iowa | 37,401,376 | 32,305,237 | 30,364,473 |
| 27. Oklahoma | 35,187,695 | 29,811,858 | 26,836,440 |
| 28. Florida | 33,304,979 | 28,539,253 | 27,995,559 |

Domestic exports from the United States by States from which shipped during the calendar year 1929, arranged according to magnitude, with comparative figures for 1928 and 1927—Con.

| State | 1929 | 1928 | 1927 |
|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 29. Arkansas | \$32,170,607 | \$24,744,473 | \$23,603,916 |
| 30. South Carolina | 27,524,304 | 22,538,080 | 36,280,316 |
| 31. Kentucky | 23,751,693 | 22,097,480 | 24,228,793 |
| 32. Kansas | 23,805,710 | 26,256,804 | 24,617,816 |
| 33. Rhode Island | 18,703,591 | 16,238,463 | 15,295,530 |
| 34. Arizona | 14,438,868 | 13,105,944 | 7,720,014 |
| 35. Nebraska | 12,406,248 | 10,788,231 | 14,803,557 |
| 36. Maine | 7,311,106 | 5,868,803 | 6,422,828 |
| 37. New Hampshire | 7,245,762 | 7,062,472 | 7,014,802 |
| 38. South Dakota | 7,095,247 | 6,140,142 | 5,194,484 |
| 39. Delaware | 6,252,506 | 4,450,514 | 3,922,799 |
| 40. Montana | 5,680,894 | 6,814,817 | 5,905,027 |
| 41. Porto Rico | 5,300,770 | 5,841,363 | 8,386,683 |
| 42. Colorado | 4,001,887 | 3,419,994 | 3,394,095 |
| 43. Vermont | 3,790,767 | 4,367,914 | 3,393,236 |
| 44. Hawaii | 3,738,352 | 3,955,454 | 3,629,496 |
| 45. Idaho | 1,956,019 | 2,282,991 | 1,884,526 |
| 46. New Mexico | 1,517,885 | 2,105,133 | 1,037,927 |
| 47. Wyoming | 1,451,983 | 2,703,557 | 4,603,488 |
| 48. Utah | 1,006,411 | 647,152 | 911,457 |
| 49. Washington, D. C. | 998,365 | 576,787 | 537,657 |
| 50. North Dakota | 942,834 | 1,296,518 | 553,217 |
| 51. Alaska | 559,465 | 933,735 | 456,673 |
| 52. Nevada | 543,085 | 416,107 | 526,366 |
| Total | 5,157,083,027 | 5,043,973,142 | 4,758,721,078 |

The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce maintains local offices in 34 cities:

Atlanta, Birmingham, Boston, Buffalo, Charleston, Charlotte, Chicago, Dallas, Denver, Des Moines, Detroit, El Paso, Galveston, Houston, Indianapolis, Jacksonville, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Louisville, Memphis, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Mobile, New Orleans, New York, Norfolk, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Portland, Oreg., Salt Lake City, St. Louis, San Francisco, Seattle, Wilmington, Del.

These offices give aid and advice to the business interests in their respective communities in connection with sales and export problems, when necessary, of course, referring inquiries to the bureau at Washington. They also serve as distributing centers for bureau publications, seeking to place trade information directly in the hands of the persons most vitally interested. Through the cooperation of the local chambers of commerce, offices are also maintained, practically without great expense to the Government, at 46 important cities, making 80 offices in all. The bureau's sales information reports have grown from 11,684 inquiries in 1921 to 161,474 inquiries in 1930, an increase of nearly 1,400 per cent.

The location of the 46 cooperative offices referred to is as follows: Baltimore, Md.; Chattanooga, Tenn.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Newark, N. J.; Rochester, N. Y.; Akron, Ohio; Anniston, Ala.; Beaumont, Tex.; Binghamton, N. Y.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Columbus, Ga.; Columbus, Ohio; Dayton, Ohio; Erie, Pa.; Fort Smith, Ark.; Fort Worth, Tex.; Greensboro, N. C.; Hartford, Conn.; Keokuk, Iowa; Lake Charles, La.; Laredo, Tex.; Lowell, Mass.; Longview, Wash.; New Haven, Conn.; Oakland, Calif.; Omaha, Neb.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Pensacola, Fla.; Providence, R. I.; Raleigh, N. C.; Richmond, Va.; Rockford, Ill.; San Antonio, Tex.; San Diego, Calif.; South Bend, Ind.; Spokane, Wash.; Syracuse, N. Y.; Tacoma, Wash.; Tampa, Fla.; Toledo, Ohio; Tulsa, Okla.; Trenton, N. J.; Wichita, Kans.; Waterbury, Conn.; Worcester, Mass.

Dollars and cents results reported by district offices, fiscal year 1929-30

| District office | Firms served | Firms reporting | Amount reported | Average benefit per firm reporting |
|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| Atlanta | 197 | 21 | \$1,288,910.27 | \$61,373.67 |
| Baltimore | 261 | 9 | 335,920.00 | 37,324.44 |
| Birmingham | 100 | 13 | 503,991.00 | 38,768.53 |
| Boston | 2,092 | 204 | 4,334,464.94 | 21,247.37 |
| Buffalo | 390 | 21 | 120,223.54 | 5,724.93 |
| Charlotte | 218 | 19 | 1,994,190.29 | 104,957.38 |
| Chicago | 2,246 | 110 | 737,306.00 | 6,702.78 |
| Cincinnati | 347 | 23 | 117,502.37 | 5,108.79 |
| Cleveland | 669 | 42 | 384,555.61 | 9,156.08 |
| Dallas | 134 | 22 | 1,207,619.56 | 54,891.79 |
| Denver | 112 | 11 | 98,155.85 | 8,923.26 |
| Des Moines | 313 | 49 | 692,126.64 | 14,125.03 |
| Detroit | 892 | 131 | 6,294,565.51 | 47,821.11 |
| Galveston | 22 | 6 | 187,708.47 | 31,284.74 |
| Houston | 304 | 44 | 2,287,493.45 | 51,988.48 |
| Indianapolis | 523 | 35 | 644,456.96 | 18,413.05 |
| Jacksonville | 160 | 33 | 1,313,063.41 | 39,789.80 |
| Kansas City | 376 | 27 | 543,095.46 | 20,114.64 |
| Los Angeles | 856 | 30 | 1,483,485.61 | 49,449.52 |
| Louisville | 263 | 36 | 333,974.48 | 9,332.63 |
| Memphis | 267 | 65 | 2,404,745.72 | 36,999.16 |
| Milwaukee | 492 | 40 | 218,509.16 | 5,462.72 |
| Minneapolis | 456 | 47 | 1,246,533.77 | 2,658.16 |
| Mobile | 78 | 21 | 194,463.00 | 9,260.14 |
| New Orleans | 308 | 43 | 663,609.00 | 1,543.25 |
| New York | 7,848 | 272 | 8,050,505.14 | 29,567.44 |
| Norfolk | 344 | 47 | 398,530.37 | 8,479.36 |
| Philadelphia | 1,495 | 167 | 2,868,359.43 | 17,175.80 |
| Pittsburgh | 596 | 51 | 626,206.69 | 12,278.44 |
| Portland | 168 | 11 | 2,865,080.00 | 191,045.33 |

Dollars and cents results reported by district offices, fiscal year 1929-30—Continued

| District office | Firms served | Firms reporting | Amount reported | Average benefit per firm reporting |
|--------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| San Francisco..... | 825 | 61 | \$3,102,236.69 | \$50,856.33 |
| Seattle..... | 908 | 22 | 1,844,797.53 | 83,854.43 |
| St. Louis..... | 656 | 89 | 1,119,684.32 | 12,580.72 |
| Wilmington..... | 90 | 13 | 277,581.18 | 21,375.47 |
| Totals..... | 24,986 | 1,835 | 50,754,545.42 | 32,946.02 |

The bureau has compiled for me the postwar average of exports and imports, the grand total, from 8 or 10 of our principal exporting and importing countries from 1921 to 1930, and the pre-war average from 1910 to 1914, and the percentage of increase or decrease. I am pleased to say that in most instances there was an increase as far as exports were concerned.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. May I inquire for what period of time the gentleman is inserting the exports?

Mr. ACKERMAN. From 1921 to 1930, and also for the year 1930 itself. It is brought right up to date.

The division of statistical research of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce prepared the following tables for me, showing a comparison of exports and imports for 1921 to 1930, and a separate table showing 1930 by itself. Due to sharp price declines, the purchasing power of the dollar becomes 79 per cent of the pre-war dollar, or 9 cents above that used in the 1921-1930 table.

Comparison of exports and imports for 1921-1930, with average for pre-war years, using 70 cents as the value of a postwar dollar

| | Postwar average, 1921-1930 | Value at 70 cents | Pre-war average, 1910-1914 | Per cent change from pre-war average to postwar average, dollar valued at 70 cents | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--|----------|
| | | | | Increase | Decrease |
| Exports..... | \$4,587,900,000 | \$3,211,530,000 | \$2,165,818,000 | 48.3 | ----- |
| Total..... | 2,793,500,000 | 1,955,450,000 | 1,583,351,000 | 23.5 | ----- |
| United Kingdom ¹ | 888,100,000 | 621,670,000 | 567,592,000 | 9.5 | ----- |
| Germany..... | 391,900,000 | 274,330,000 | 304,098,000 | ----- | 9.8 |
| Belgium..... | 108,600,000 | 76,020,000 | 53,117,000 | 43.1 | ----- |
| France..... | 254,700,000 | 178,290,000 | 138,841,000 | 28.4 | ----- |
| Italy..... | 163,100,000 | 114,170,000 | 65,966,000 | 73.1 | ----- |
| Greece..... | 15,500,000 | 10,850,000 | 873,000 | 1,142.8 | ----- |
| Netherlands..... | 134,800,000 | 94,360,000 | 104,575,000 | ----- | 9.8 |
| Denmark..... | 46,200,000 | 32,340,000 | 15,393,000 | 110.1 | ----- |
| Norway..... | 25,400,000 | 17,780,000 | 7,819,000 | 127.4 | ----- |
| Sweden..... | 44,400,000 | 31,080,000 | 10,033,000 | 209.8 | ----- |
| Canada..... | 720,800,000 | 504,560,000 | 315,044,000 | 60.2 | ----- |
| Imports..... | 3,740,400,000 | 2,618,280,000 | 1,688,874,000 | 55.0 | ----- |
| Total..... | 960,600,000 | 967,820,000 | 852,690,000 | 13.5 | ----- |
| United Kingdom ¹ | 341,300,000 | 238,910,000 | 278,897,000 | ----- | 14.3 |
| Germany..... | 151,700,000 | 106,190,000 | 176,462,000 | ----- | 39.8 |
| Belgium..... | 64,400,000 | 45,080,000 | 40,360,000 | 11.7 | ----- |
| France..... | 150,500,000 | 105,350,000 | 130,130,000 | ----- | 19.0 |
| Italy..... | 90,600,000 | 63,420,000 | 51,149,000 | 24.0 | ----- |
| Greece..... | 20,100,000 | 14,070,000 | 3,329,000 | 322.6 | ----- |
| Netherlands..... | 76,200,000 | 53,340,000 | 34,937,000 | 52.7 | ----- |
| Denmark..... | 5,100,000 | 3,570,000 | 2,597,000 | 37.5 | ----- |
| Norway..... | 20,100,000 | 14,070,000 | 8,086,000 | 74.0 | ----- |
| Sweden..... | 40,600,000 | 28,420,000 | 9,530,000 | 198.2 | ----- |
| Canada..... | 422,000,000 | 295,400,000 | 117,213,000 | 152.0 | ----- |

¹Irish Free State is included with United Kingdom prior to 1925.

United States exports and imports in 1930 (estimated), as compared with the average for five years, using 79 cents as the value of a 1930 dollar

| | Estimated value year ended Dec. 31, 1930 | Value at 79 cents | 1910-1914 average | Per cent change from pre-war average; 1930 dollar valued at 79 cents | |
|---------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|--|----------|
| | | | | Increase | Decrease |
| Exports..... | \$3,850,000,000 | \$3,041,500,000 | \$2,165,818,000 | 40.4 | ----- |
| Total..... | 2,261,300,000 | 1,788,427,000 | 1,583,351,000 | 12.8 | ----- |
| United Kingdom..... | 676,300,000 | 534,277,000 | 567,592,000 | ----- | 5.9 |
| Germany..... | 279,500,000 | 220,805,000 | 304,098,000 | ----- | 27.4 |

United States exports and imports in vrcj (estimated), as compared with the average for five years, using 79 cents as the value of a 1930 dollar—Continued

| | Estimated value year ended Dec. 31, 1930 | Value at 79 cents | 1910-1914 average | Per cent change from pre-war average; 1930 dollar valued at 79 cents | |
|---------------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|--|----------|
| | | | | Increase | Decrease |
| Exports—Con. | | | | | |
| Belgium..... | 86,900,000 | 68,651,000 | 53,117,000 | 29.2 | ----- |
| France..... | 221,900,000 | 175,301,000 | 138,841,000 | 26.3 | ----- |
| Italy..... | 99,500,000 | 78,605,000 | 65,966,000 | 19.2 | ----- |
| Greece..... | 13,000,000 | 10,270,000 | 873,000 | 1,076.4 | ----- |
| Netherlands..... | 102,600,000 | 81,054,000 | 104,575,000 | ----- | 22.5 |
| Denmark..... | 40,900,000 | 32,311,000 | 15,393,000 | 109.9 | ----- |
| Norway..... | 20,600,000 | 16,274,000 | 7,819,000 | 108.1 | ----- |
| Sweden..... | 45,000,000 | 35,550,000 | 10,033,000 | 254.3 | ----- |
| Canada..... | 675,100,000 | 533,329,000 | 315,044,000 | 69.3 | ----- |
| Imports..... | 3,050,000,000 | 2,402,500,000 | 1,688,874,000 | 42.7 | ----- |
| Total..... | 1,181,000,000 | 932,990,000 | 852,690,000 | 9.4 | ----- |
| United Kingdom..... | 215,100,000 | 169,929,000 | 278,897,000 | ----- | 39.1 |
| Germany..... | 179,100,000 | 141,489,000 | 176,462,000 | ----- | 19.8 |
| Belgium..... | 53,100,000 | 41,949,000 | 40,360,000 | 3.9 | ----- |
| France..... | 115,400,000 | 91,166,000 | 130,130,000 | ----- | 29.9 |
| Italy..... | 80,300,000 | 63,437,000 | 51,149,000 | 24.0 | ----- |
| Greece..... | 11,200,000 | 8,848,000 | 3,329,000 | 165.8 | ----- |
| Netherlands..... | 52,800,000 | 41,712,000 | 34,937,000 | 19.4 | ----- |
| Denmark..... | 3,100,000 | 2,449,000 | 2,597,000 | ----- | 5.7 |
| Norway..... | 18,600,000 | 14,694,000 | 8,086,000 | 81.7 | ----- |
| Sweden..... | 44,800,000 | 35,392,000 | 9,530,000 | 271.4 | ----- |
| Canada..... | 407,500,000 | 321,925,000 | 117,213,000 | 174.6 | ----- |

UNITED KINGDOM

The decline in United States exports to the United Kingdom appears to be largely accounted for by severe price declines in several important commodities as, for example, tobacco and copper.

The marked decrease in our imports from the United Kingdom is to a large extent explained by a large decline in our quantity imports of crude rubber and a marked drop in the price of this same commodity; to some extent it is due to a drop in our imports of tin, whose price has also fallen.

GERMANY

The drop in our export trade with Germany, even on a pre-war price base, is due to severe drops in both the quantity and value exports of unmanufactured cotton and copper.

The decline of nearly 20 per cent in our imports from Germany is primarily due to a marked downward trend in purchases of chemicals—particularly potash—toys and cotton laces.

FRANCE

The decline in American imports of French goods is to be found in a drop in our purchases of cotton laces, works of art, wines, and other articles of the luxury or semiluxury class.

SWEDEN

Our trade with Sweden has risen over 200 per cent in both directions since before the war even on a pre-war price base. The bulge in exports is accounted for almost entirely by postwar shipments on an increasing scale of unmanufactured cotton, gasoline and naphtha, refined copper, automobiles, motor trucks, and rubber tires. The increase in imports is due to rapidly growing and tremendous purchases of wood pulp and newsprint.

CANADA

The rather marked increase in Canadian imports is also explained largely by rising purchases of wood pulp and newsprint. Other items contributing are unrefined copper, lumber, grain, and cattle, the latter two to a lesser extent than the first two.

GREECE

Increasing exports in recent years of wheat and automobiles account for the high percentage increase of shipments to Greece. The shipments of automobiles developed from a pre-war base which was virtually nil. The marked increase in imports from the same country was due almost entirely to large purchases of cigarette leaf tobacco.

NORWAY

The increase in exports to Norway resulted from larger sales of a number of miscellaneous commodities. Principal items showing large increases are wheat flour, leaf tobacco, gasoline, and automobiles. The commodities purchased in larger amounts from Norway include sardines, cod and cod-liver oil, aluminum, wood pulp, and ferromanganese.

DENMARK

Export increases resulted mainly from larger sales of gasoline and automobiles.

In addition to the trade-promotion activities of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, so ably presided over by Mr. Cooper and supervised by that dean of commerce, Doctor Klein, every other bureau and division in the Department of Commerce is bending its energies to bring about increased trade activities. The Bureau of Standards was sometimes regarded as confining its work on the technical side of aids to business and production. Now, however, its simplified-practice recommendations and suggestions have brought it into the field on the practical side of all commercial enterprises.

Doctor Burgess, the very competent director, and his staff call our attention to a survey conducted by the division during last year and which has created a great deal of interest dealt with packing and wrapping methods employed in department stores. A personal inspection was made of 34 representative department stores all over the eastern half of the country with an aggregate sales volume of nearly \$600,000,000 a year.

Their packing and wrapping methods were carefully studied and recommendations are being formulated on which simplified-practice recommendations can be based covering sizes and varieties for packing supplies and the most efficient and economical methods of folding and preparing merchandise for delivery. When it is remembered that there are more than 6,000 department stores in the United States doing an annual business of approximately \$6,500,000,000 and that these stores buy wrapping and packing supplies valued at more than \$25,000,000, the importance of any economies which can be effected along these lines is obvious.

As an example of standardization affecting the rubber industry may be mentioned the case of pneumatic tires for automobiles. Here the bureau, in cooperation with the Rubber Association of America, undertook a practical investigation of tires with respect to materials, design, and performance. The result has been a very decided increase in the efficiency, durability, and uniformity of tires and the development of a Federal specification according to which all Government purchases are made and which has been adopted by numerous States and other consumers as a basis for the award of contracts. The experimental work involved in the development of this specification required special endurance machines designed to simulate road conditions. These machines, operating under conditions that have been standardized, are being used both for routine performance tests in connection with contracts, and for experimental testing in cooperation with manufacturers, to determine the effect of change in design and construction.

With respect to leather, laboratory research has shown us that a cheap material derived from the waste liquor of sulphite pulp mills has definite tanning properties.

Tanning investigations showed that sulphite cellulose extracts could be blended with ordinary vegetable tanning materials and used to produce heavy leathers with satisfactory physical and chemical properties.

The commercial significance of the application of this work in the tanning industry is indicated by an estimated saving in tanning costs of from 10 to 20 per cent. Other factors of importance are that its use will conserve material now largely wasted and help to solve stream pollution problems caused by the dumping of the waste liquors into the rivers. Its use will also make the tanning industry less dependent upon imported tanning materials and tend to

compensate for the loss of domestic chestnut wood extract, the source of which is being depleted by blight.

On the weights and measures division the country depends for uniformity and exactness in instruments and devices based on the fundamental units of length, mass, and time. The standards maintained at the bureau are the official standards of the country. This division tests great quantities of apparatus for the Federal and State Governments as well as for manufacturers and users. The work ranges in scope from the smallest measurable quantities up to railroad test cars of 100,000 pounds capacity, for the calibration of which the bureau maintains a master track scale at Chicago and three test cars, with weights in 10,000-pound units, which cars travel about the country testing railroad and shippers' weighing scales. A uniform basis of measuring freight schedules totaling over \$1,500,000,000 is thus maintained. The mechanical industries manufacturing interchangeable parts, such as for automobiles and typewriters, are greatly helped by the work of this division, which is compelled in some cases to be able to measure lengths as closely as one-millionth of an inch (one twenty-five millionth of a millimeter) for gages used by these industries.

The paper section of the bureau is constantly studying the possibilities of different plant fibers as paper-making materials. An extensive study of carao fiber from Brazil showed that this material has unusual possibilities as a raw material for the manufacture of high-grade writing papers. Again, at the request of the Siamese Government, tests were made of rice straw, lalang grass, and banana trees, all of which are abundant in Siam. The results were so satisfactory that a commercial paper mill was built there to utilize these materials. The results of similar tests are constantly furnishing information to the industry. South America is dependent to a very large extent on imports for many grades of paper. One grade of paramount importance is newsprint. The discovery of a new source of raw material for newsprint in abundant quantities or the development of processes for making newsprint from the materials now unused would be of inestimable value, and it is not unlikely that these and other services to the industry can be accomplished by Government research laboratories.

There is another important field of industrial research in which the bureau is active, namely, the utilization of waste-land products.

Wastes from the corn and sugar-cane plants are similar in nature in that they involve the stalks and leaves, and the cob in the case of corn. At least 100,000,000 tons of these products are commercially available annually in the United States, but are wasted and await the call for conversion into valuable products. The cornstalk consists of a very light inside pith and an outside fibrous shell. The pith is readily separated by a special machine and is being converted in semicommercial studies into insulating materials resembling cork products. The fibrous shell is being made into a variety of crude and refined cellulose products. By simple maceration a gel is formed which, on drying, yields a tough, horny product called maizolith. It is suitable for making gears, bushings, electrical fixtures, and other products requiring toughness, strength, and electrical insulating properties. By means of chemical and disintegrating methods, the shell fibers are separated and somewhat purified. The pulp is run over screens and separated from the water in continuous felts from one-fourth to 1 inch thick. These are dried in the form of loose boards which are cut to size to form wall board for insulating the walls and ceilings of houses. They may be waterproofed and fireproofed. They may be painted and can also be covered with plaster for interior finish. The thick boards may be used to insulate the interiors of refrigerator cars, household refrigerators, and ice houses. The wet, loose, porous sheets may be steam-heated under pressure to form a strong cornstalk lumber. Similar products made from bagasse have wide markets.

The cornstalk fibers give good grades of pulp with proper chemical and physical treatments. Newspapers and book

papers have thus been made. As side products, xylan adhesives and carbon black are obtained.

When further refined the pulp yields a high grade, pure alpha cellulose, which has been used to make transparent glassene papers, viscose, and rayon textiles.

Straws and hulls from wheat and oats and other cereals are wasted annually to the extent of tens of millions of tons. Work is under way to convert the straw into high-grade pulp and paper products. Already they are used in low-grade papers and boxboard. Oat hulls are the source of the new and widely used commercial chemical furfural entering into plastics and binders for abrasive wheels and electrical apparatus. The straw offers possibilities for production of producer gas for household use by fermentation, combustion, and distillation methods.

These new industries which are converting the waste products of the farm into useful articles are the direct results of laboratory research. They are bringing increased returns to our farmers, providing employment for labor in new local factories, and providing the great mass of consumers with things not heretofore readily available.

I have also obtained through the Library of Congress the expenditure for the promotion of foreign trade in other countries, to show what our competitors are doing abroad, and I have the figures here for Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy, and Spain.

Expenditures for the promotion of foreign trade in certain foreign countries

BELGIUM

[Source: Loi contenant le budget du Ministère des affaires étrangères pour l'exercice 1926 (-1930) Moniteur Belge, May 23, 1926, p. 2814-2817; Aug. 4, 1927, p. 3629-3632; Jan. 6, 1929, p. 3033; Apr. 6, 1929, p. 1670-1673; May 23, 1930, p. 2684-2686]

| | Calendar year— | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 1926 | 1927 | 1928 | 1929 | 1930 |
| 1. Miscellaneous expenses and trade promotion; purchase of commercial documents for the legations and consulates; scholarships; publication of works on commerce and industry; share of Belgium in the expenses of the International Commercial Institute; commercial missions; subsidy to the Agence commerciale belge de l'Est africain..... | Francs 265,000 | Francs 140,000 | Francs 185,000 | Francs 185,000 | Francs 185,000 |
| 2. Service of information and propaganda..... | 250,000 | 185,000 | 225,000 | 277,500 | 377,500 |
| Total..... | 515,000 | 325,000 | 410,000 | 462,500 | 562,500 |

FRANCE¹

| | Calendar year | | | | Apr. 1, 1930-Mar. 31, 1931 estimates |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | 1926 | 1927 | 1928 | 1929 ² | |
| 1. French commercial bureaus abroad..... | Francs 2,450,000 | Francs 2,743,000 | Francs 2,923,500 | Francs 2,867,675 | Francs 2,295,600 |
| 2. Office National du Commerce Extérieur..... | 1,250,000 | 1,530,000 | 1,796,000 | 1,946,000 | 2,056,250 |
| 3. Commercial attachés and agents; salaries..... | 1,600,000 | 1,909,500 | 2,222,596 | 7,446,790 | 9,885,000 |
| 4. Commercial attachés and agents; missions, expenses of installation, traveling expenses, etc..... | 2,800,000 | 2,828,000 | 2,852,000 | 12,003,940 | 13,005,000 |
| 5. Commercial attachés and agents; compensating allowances for exchange losses..... | 9,088,000 | 9,800,000 | 12,300,000 | | |
| 6. Commercial attachés and agents; compensating cost of living allowances, etc., in countries with depreciated currency..... | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 1,137,000 | | |
| 7. Subventions to French chambers of commerce abroad and to commercial museums; commercial missions..... | 650,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 | 890,000 | 890,000 |
| Total..... | 19,838,000 | 21,460,500 | 23,881,096 | 25,154,305 | 28,131,850 |

¹ Loi contenant le budget du Ministère des affaires étrangères pour l'exercice 1926 (-29) Journal officiel Apr. 30, 1926, p. 4953; Dec. 19, 1926, p. 13195; Dec. 28, 1927, p. 13095; Dec. 31, 1928, p. 13691; Projet de loi: portant fixation du budget général de l'exercice 1930, commerce et industrie, p. 9.

² Fiscal year changed in December, 1929, to begin April 1. An additional one-fourth of the appropriations for 1929 granted for first three months of 1930. (Act of Dec. 27, 1929, J. O. Dec. 28, 1929, p. 13874.)

³ Includes also expenses relative to foreign expositions and fairs, congresses, etc., medals.

Expenditures for the promotion of foreign trade in certain foreign countries—Continued.

GREAT BRITAIN¹

| | Fiscal year ending Mar. 31— | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | 1927-28 | 1928-29 | 1929-30 | 1929-31 |
| 1. Department of overseas trade..... | £328,962 | £325,997 | £378,633 | £502,972 |
| 2. Department of overseas trade, salary of directors..... | 2,507 | 2,507 | | |
| Total..... | 331,469 | 328,504 | 378,633 | 502,972 |

¹ Estimates, civil services, 1928-1930, Class VI, 4, p. 48. Department of overseas trade.

ITALY¹

| | Years ending June 30— | | | | Estimates, 1931 |
|---|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | 1927 | 1928 | 1929 | 1930 | |
| 1. Italian chambers of commerce abroad; commercial agents and agencies abroad; organization of, and institutions for, the promotion of foreign trade; commercial museums and field exhibits; commercial scholarships..... | Lire 1,500,000 | Lire 1,537,000 | Lire 1,400,000 | Lire 1,200,000 | Lire 1,200,000 |
| 2. Commercial agents; housing allowances, etc..... | 2,250,000 | | | | |
| 3. Expenses for the installation of new offices for the said agents, office and traveling expenses, etc..... | 2,250,000 | 2,250,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 |
| 4. Expenses connected with the promotion of production and export of citrus fruits in application of the act of July 8, 1903..... | 12,500 | | | | |
| 5. Printing of publications concerning customs tariffs and commercial treaties..... | 130,000 | | | | |
| 6. Purchase of books and subscriptions to foreign and Italian newspapers and periodicals for the Ufficio del Trattati di Commercio (Bureau of Commercial Treaties)..... | 15,000 | 15,000 | 13,500 | 23,500 | 23,500 |
| 7. Contribution to the expenses of the International Commercial Institute of Brussels..... | 37,000 | (?) | (?) | (?) | (?) |
| 8. Expenses of the Ufficio Speciale d'Informazioni Commerciali sull'Estero (Special Foreign Trade Information Bureau)..... | 150,000 | | | | |
| 9. Contribution to the expense of the National Institute for Exportation Expenses for the acquisition of books and periodicals for the service of foreign commerce..... | | 4,020,000 | 4,010,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| Total..... | 6,374,500 | 7,822,000 | 7,423,500 | 7,223,500 | 7,223,500 |

¹ Stato di previsione della spesa del Ministero dell'economia nazionale, per l'esercizio finanziario 1926-27 (1929-30) Gazzetta Ufficiale, June 21, 1926, p. 2583; June 13, 1927, p. 2379; June 15, 1928, p. 2571-2572; June 24, 1929, p. 2934. Stato di previsione della spesa del Ministero delle corporazioni per l'esercizio finanziario, 1930-31 (camera dei deputati, no. 447a), p. 39.

² Appropriation for item (7) included.

³ Purchase of books and periodicals not included.

SPAIN¹

| | Fiscal year | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
| | 1926 ² (last half) | 1927 | 1928 | 1929 | 1930 |
| 2. Spanish chambers of commerce abroad..... | Pesetas 75,000 | Pesetas 150,000 | Pesetas 170,000 | Pesetas 200,000 | Pesetas |

¹ Budget acts in Gaceta de Madrid, July 1, 1926, Jan. 5, 1927, Jan. 4, 1928, Jan. 4, 1929, Jan. 4, 1930.

² Fiscal year changed to calendar year, beginning January, 1927.

Detailed figures for Spain not available. Budget figures are too comprehensive.

I may say in connection with the particular district which I have the honor to represent here, that many of the men are returning to work. Six thousand of them were taken on a few days ago by the Singer Sewing Machine Co., which, when running full time, employs about 10,000, and a printing press manufacturing establishment on the border of my district, but not actually in my district, is doing a rushing business. It is running night and day manufacturing print-

ing presses, and they tell me recently they had orders on their books for two years to come.

I thank the committee for its kind attention. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GLOVER].

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein some newspaper statements with reference to the subject which I propose to talk about, and to include also a letter and telegram from the governor to me and from Mr. Williams, of Hot Springs, who is on the President's unemployment committee, and also a letter of mine to the gentleman who made an address at England, Ark., and his reply thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, on January 9 the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] addressed this House, and in that address charged that the incident that occurred at England, Ark., a few days ago, and the trouble in Arkansas was a communistic movement. In the course of his address I tried to get him to yield to a question so that I might inquire as to the source of his information but he declined to yield, and as England is in my congressional district I feel it my duty to reply to his remarks.

I do not want to misquote the gentleman and for that reason I will give his exact language as will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 9. Mr. Wood said:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, many, many years ago when I was considerably younger than I am now, there was an epidemic of hog cholera in our country and the hog family was very nearly exterminated. In consequence there was attracted to the prairies of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa, and all of that great section where hogs were raised in great numbers a myriad of buzzards and vultures, that fell upon the carcasses of these dead animals.

Now another great disaster has overtaken this country and misery has been spread not only over the prairies of our section but over the entire land, there is another set of vultures in human form that are taking advantage of the situation. There is an enemy within our gates to-day which if it is permitted to go on is sooner or later going to destroy this Government we love so well.

This insidious foe started a number of years ago; it started its propaganda unmolested, and through the rural sections of the country, in large part unnoticed, is now poison dropping through the agricultural sections of the country. They are in Arkansas; they are in Oklahoma; they are all over the agricultural regions; and are preying faster on that section of the country which is worse hit by this great drought.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I deny this. I think I am about as well acquainted in Arkansas as the average man who has lived there all his life. I have lived in the district I have the honor to represent all my life, and I say to you upon my honor that I have never seen a communist in Arkansas, and I challenge the gentleman to name a single communist in Arkansas or that ever has been there. He ought to prove this statement or he ought to come to the floor of this House and retract it. No man shall thus charge my people as long as I am permitted to serve here and the matter be passed by unnoticed.

Again, he says:

I desire to call your attention to some of the things they are doing. They are trying to destroy the banking institutions of this country.

The gentleman knows that we have had more than a hundred bank failures in Arkansas and he evidently meant to charge that communists are the cause of our bank failures. If the gentleman will make an investigation and find a single bank failure that could in the remotest sense be charged to that influence, I will thank him to do so. Communists had nothing to do with any of them failing and I challenge the gentleman to furnish any proof that such influence was exerted in my State.

If he can not prove it, he should retract his statement. Again the gentleman used this language:

There is no question but what this whole business that happened down at England was a set-up arrangement, staged, if you please, and which had been contemplated for some time.

Now, if the gentleman has any such information as that, he should have furnished it to the House; and if not, he should retract it.

After this statement was made by the gentleman, my colleague from Arkansas [Mrs. WINGO] wired her friend, Mrs. Ben High, at England, Ark., and at whose store this is alleged to have occurred, and this is the reply she received and which was read by the Clerk of this House and will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 12, which reads as follows:

ENGLAND, ARK., January 12, 1931.

EFFIEGENE WINGO: Forty-three men drove up to our store, came in, and stated they had come for something to eat, and unless it was given they would take it. Ben asked them to have patience, and told them he thought they would get food. They then went across street to mayor's office, where a crowd of four or five hundred gathered. They were assured that some arrangements would be made. There was no violence. The 43 men who started the drive were mostly customers of ours, and honest, hard-working men. Two hundred and sixty-seven families were fed that day. Fourteen hundred and forty-four families fed up to Saturday night last. Condition serious.

Mrs. BEN HIGH.

Does that look like a communistic movement to the gentleman? No; it was customers, farmers living in that community, who were appealing for bread to live on.

Again the gentleman used this language:

It was the workers in Little Rock that got up to England in Arkansas, and it was the workers in Little Rock who sent out word, who sent out an Associated Press dispatch from Little Rock within less than an hour after these people began to assemble for this food.

I challenge the gentleman to name a single man in Little Rock who had anything to do with this in any way, and if he can not do so, he ought in fairness retract it.

Not only are the people in many localities in that State in distress, but also the cattle and horses are starving to death. To prove to you that there was no justification for the gentleman's statements I quote a statement which was printed in the Arkansas Gazette on January 11 and headed "No Communists in England Vicinity":

STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN WOOD DENIED BY CIVIC LEADERS

From Washington, D. C., comes a statement that is astounding to persons here, a statement which illustrates, it is said, the painful lack of knowledge outside the State of conditions in the England community.

Chairman Wood, of the House Appropriations Committee, is quoted as saying that the uprising here last Saturday was fomented by communist workers. This statement was characterized by Mayor W. O. Williams to-day as preposterous.

No one in this community ever saw a communist, according to responsible citizens here, and many of the farmers who are in dire need of food don't know the meaning of the word, and not one of them, it is believed, could be influenced in the least by communist propaganda. They are, according to estimates, about 98 per cent of old Anglo-Saxon stock, and radicalism is repugnant to most of them.

They were driven to desperate measures, it is reported here, because their children were hungry, and when the Red Cross questionnaires were exhausted they feared their food supply would be cut off.

The statement that only 40 persons were clamoring for food is in part correct, according to C. E. Hankins, chairman of the Red Cross chapter, who said about that many others not so vociferous were in the crowd, as indicated by the fact that he issued 150 orders for food after the Red Cross authorized him to do so.

Even the ringleaders were not boisterous or disorderly, it is said, and were perfectly contented when they learned that food would be issued. They are known to be very peaceable under ordinary conditions, and many of them are hard-working farmers who were, until the drought ruined them, prosperous and contented.

To show you the class of citizenship that these 43 men are in, and to disprove the statement that they were communists, I beg to quote from a telegram that was sent from England by a friend of my colleague from Arkansas [Mrs. WINGO] by her friend, Mrs. Ben High, whose husband was the owner of the store where this request and demonstration was made. This telegram is set out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 12 and which reads in part as follows:

There was no violence. The 43 men who started the drive were mostly customers of ours and honest, hard-working men. Two hundred and sixty-seven families were fed that day. Fourteen hundred and forty-four families fed up to Saturday night last. Condition serious.

This is the class of men that have been described as vultures and communists.

In the Arkansas Gazette of January 14, 1931, Col. J. F. Lucey, President Hoover's representative on unemployment in six Southwestern States, is credited with having made this statement; and I quote his statement as printed in this press under the heading "At President's Request":

He [Mr. Lucey] revealed that it was at the President's personal request that he visited England, Lonoke County, scene of the demonstration January 3, when farmers demanded food for their families. With Dr. William DeKleine and Albert Evans, national medical director and assistant disaster relief director, respectively, for the Red Cross, Colonel Lucey met with the representative citizens of England yesterday, and he is quoted as saying this: "I found the best type of American citizens there" he reported. There are no communists among them. I don't think it would be healthy for any one to talk communism there. The situation is grave, however, and I was informed that England's problem is typical of that in countless other Arkansas communities. But no request for those people had come to me. I didn't realize what the situation was. I doubt that the President realizes it. The plantation system in the State complicates the rural unemployment situation and the State leaders should determine upon a plan of more or less permanent nature for affording relief. Merely day-to-day relief will not suffice.

This shows by the representatives who were sent as he states by the request of the President of the United States, disproves the gentleman from Indiana's statement that this was a communistic move and timed off to happen just when it did, and inspired by men from Little Rock, to be untrue, and knowing the gentleman as I do, I hope he will now apologize for the statements he has made with reference to my people on the floor of the House.

But we find that no sooner is one charge refuted than another is made, and it is now published in the press that Colonel Lucey makes the bold charge that Arkansas is lacking in leadership to relieve the unemployed in that State. I challenge this statement as being incorrect, and if an investigation of it was made it would be found to be as groundless as is the charge from the gentleman from Indiana above referred to.

There is an organization in Arkansas for the relief of the unemployed, and each county has a county chairman, and the selection of these county chairmen were of the very best men that could be found in each county. They are composed of such men as Hon. Hamp Williams, who is chairman of the Garland County unemployment committee, and on yesterday I received a letter from him, and which reads as follows:

HOT SPRINGS, ARK., January 13, 1931.

HON. D. D. GLOVER,
Member of United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: I have a friend in Helena in the automobile business, and he writes, under date of January 5, as follows:

"Everybody here has been wiped out and off. Both banks have gone under, leaving everyone stranded. The Interstate National was an awful crash. It isn't expected to open again. Folks look like they have all been to their own funerals.

"Not a firm in Helena had a pay roll Saturday night. All credit was shut off, and one store in West Helena had to close its doors yesterday to keep down a riot. People were hungry, and they didn't stand back on threats.

"One time in history of Helena everybody is on an equal footing financially."

I am sending you some newspaper clippings from Hot Springs that indicate what we are doing over here. If the Red Cross would function properly and would undertake to feed the farmers while they are trying to make a crop we could get along all right, but if the farmers are not fed we can not make a crop. I think our condition here in Hot Springs is better than any other town in the State, and that's not saying very much.

Your friend,

HAMP WILLIAMS,

Chairman Garland County Unemployment Committee.

This chairman of this county committee had published in the New Era, a daily paper of Hot Springs, the following letter, which I shall read to you and which explains that an efficient system is being carried out in Arkansas:

EDITOR NEW ERA:

I think it was Mark Twain who said: "Everybody was talking about the weather, but nobody is ever doing anything about it."

There are lots of people in this community who are out of work and need food and clothing—too proud to beg, too honorable to steal. Somebody had better do something about it.

It is said from good authority that 1 out of every 10 persons in the United States who are gainfully employed are drawing their salaries or wages from the government—city, county, State, or national. That money is furnished by the people. Taxes, if you please; and the taxpayers have no choice in the matter. They must pay, and a lot of this money is used in paying government employees—city, county, State, national, schools, etc.—and if they were out of employment, especially at this time, they might think more of our unemployment program.

There are a lot of people in Hot Springs and Garland County walking the streets looking for employment, nothing to eat and their backs covered with rags; women and children at their homes, cold and hungry.

The question is: What are we, who have plenty and who have good, steady positions at a fair wage, going to do about it? Are we, through neglect, going to force these people to beg? They are just as proud and just as good as we are.

We have inaugurated a plan here in Hot Springs for employees to help the unemployed by contributing only one day's wage or salary to a fund for the employment of labor to be used on our parks, streets, and roads. Already 200 have responded, representing the officers and employees of one bank, two mercantile establishments, the public-utility company, one Methodist minister, and the Lions Club, none of whom are employees of the government—city, county, State, or national.

It is up to us to do our duty, and if all will help Hot Springs will receive the praise and commendation of the people everywhere. Our plan has been indorsed by Governor Parnell and Mr. Rooksbery, the State secretary of the unemployment committee of Arkansas.

HAMP WILLIAMS,

Chairman Garland County Unemployment Committee.

To show you further the distress in my State, I desire to read to you this communication from Marianna, Ark., which was recently published in many papers and which is as follows:

FRONTIER POVERTY RETURNS TO FAMINE-STRICKEN STATE—RED CROSS AGENTS FIND HOME WHERE 16 SLEEP IN 2 ROOMS, 4 TO A BED, AND RELYING ON WILD GAME FOR FOOD

By Luther Southworth

MARIANNA, ARK.—Back to the primitive days of frontier poverty. Sixteen sleeping in two dingy rooms, sometimes four in a bed, and none with shoes. A cold, dilapidated, sagging house.

In these mean surroundings and straitened conditions the family of Dike N. Baldwin, share cropper, living 16 miles from Marianna, faced the winter.

Their plight reached Red Cross headquarters at Marianna, from which hundreds of families are receiving rations as famine increases in this agricultural country, following the disastrous crop season last fall.

LACKED MONEY AND FOOD

"We have no money and we have no food and no clothes," the mother said. Clothes for each were obtained from Marianna residents, and their empty larder was filled with substantial provisions.

Three months ago one of the little girls died with typhoid fever. There is nothing to hold drinking water except a dented bucket. There are no dishes, and only a battered pan. There is one spoon for all to use.

Because of such conditions one little girl has tuberculosis, the father is sick with pleurisy, the mother is only a few weeks from death. Several of the younger children show symptoms of organic disorder. All are undernourished, ready victims to that dread pellagra.

Their condition resulted from ravages of the drought, which wiped out most of their cotton crop and destroyed all feed crops and gardens. Eleven of the 16 worked the 60-acre plot planted last year. After months of toll they saw their only hope of money destroyed by the parching sun.

RELY ON GAME MEAT

"And we have no money because we are \$200 in debt," the mother said. By day four boys tramp through the woods and fields hunting game. At night three other boys continue the search. It is their only chance of meat. They have no stock except a cow. She gives but a small quantity of milk daily for the four babies. The oldest son is married. He and his wife and two babies are included in the 16 now living together.

In another week a third family, including parents and five children, will move in. Some will sleep on the bare floor, for they can not squeeze into beds already overoccupied. There is one slim chance of getting money. "We can get 25 cents a hundred for cow bones we can find and haul to Marianna," said the oldest boy.

But it takes days to find enough carcasses to gather up 100 pounds of bones. It is this type the Red Cross is helping to feed, even though insufficient funds permit them to spend no more than 1 cent a meal for each of the needy.

Colonel Lucey, in his statement as printed in the Gazette of Arkansas, takes an opportunity to criticize the governor of the State. I received two or three days ago a letter from the Governor of Arkansas, Hon. Harvey Parnell, which reads as follows:

DEAR MR. GLOVER: Please find attached copy of my telegram of last night to the New York World and the Philadelphia Public Ledger.

The citizenship of Arkansas appreciates your activities in attempting to secure additional funds for relief to those destitute persons so badly in need of it. No stone is being left unturned here to do everything possible to assist, and my most earnest cooperation is always forthcoming.

With best personal wishes and regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HARVEY PARNELL, Governor.

In this letter he incloses to me a copy of a telegram that was sent to the New York World and the Philadelphia Public Ledger, and which I desire to read to you:

Those who have not actually investigated on the ground conditions in Arkansas resulting from the drought have no conception of the true situation. The American Red Cross announced on January 7 from division headquarters in St. Louis that it was assisting more than 20,000 families on December 31, and one week later it was carrying 30,000, with indications that it might eventually have 50,000 on its hands. The average Arkansas farm family consists of five persons. The Red Cross statement is sufficient to make it clear that the cases of destitution at that time were developing rapidly, and certainly there has been nothing to indicate that the rate of increase has been reduced. Relief agencies are caring for the hungry as rapidly as they can reach them, but it is impossible for workers to be everywhere at once. The State possesses 75 counties, and every one of them is more or less affected. I am confident many of the hungry are saying nothing about it because of a sense of pride. It must be understood that the people of Arkansas are more than 99 per cent native-born Americans, of stock that has been in the United States for many generations. They are the most independent people in the country, and it requires little imagination to realize that they regard a request for help as humiliating. They abhor the idea of being the recipients of charity, and of the hundreds of appeals received directly by the governor's office and various relief agencies the request until recently invariably was for employment that they might earn something with which to buy food.

The Federal Government proposes to make \$45,000,000 available for loans to farmers to enable them to grow crops this year, but there is no provision for food for themselves and families from the time crops are planted until they can produce something to eat. Realization of the future outlook in this respect simply aggravates the situation. A county by county survey in Arkansas discloses that at least \$5,650,000 will be required in this State during the crop-growing period in order that people on farms may be able to buy something to eat while vegetables are maturing. Our National Government from time to time has rushed to the assistance of starving people all over the world. It has freely given millions of dollars to the hungry in the Eastern Hemisphere, millions which never were repaid and which it did not expect to recover. In this instance, so far as the farmers of Arkansas are concerned, they do not want a gift, but do want means devised whereby they can be permitted to borrow money with which to purchase food. If funds are not made available from some source it simply means that thousands of people in this State will be objects of charity far beyond the period now contemplated by relief agencies.

HARVEY PARNELL,
Governor of Arkansas.

This shows that the statement of Colonel Lucey has evidently gone off before time and before he has made a thorough investigation of what his duties were in the State of Arkansas, and shows that he does not fully appreciate the great work that is being done there by the various citizens of the State through their organizations and by every means that they can use to relieve the distressed condition in my great State.

What the distressed people of my State need is not a discussion of good or bad leadership, it is a question of actual food necessities. It is not communism, it is hunger; and it ill becomes any man, as I see it, to do anything to prevent the hungry being fed.

Before I made my reply to the charge from the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood], of communism in Arkansas, I wanted to get first-hand information of what actually occurred, and in order to do so I thought it proper to inquire of the man who was present on the occasion which happened at England, Ark., and who made the address to the people when they were assembled in England, and I now read to you a letter I wrote on January 10, 1931, to this party who made the address, Mr. George Morris, of England, Ark., and which reads as follows:

JANUARY 10, 1931.

MR. GEORGE MORRIS,
England, Ark.

MY DEAR MR. MORRIS: On yesterday afternoon, Mr. Wood of Indiana, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, made a speech on the floor of the House in which he charged the demonstration

for food at England to be caused by communist movements and in which speech, which was recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 9, at page 1884, he uses this language:

"This is the kind of doctrine that is being circulated, and, if the facts are to be considered, there is no question but what this whole business that happened down at England, Ark., was a set-up arrangement, staged, if you please, and which had been contemplated for some considerable time to take place upon the very day that the Red Cross had given notice that upon that particular day they would supply food to those who were suffering in that community. When 500 people who came there to get food that was promised by the Red Cross, 40 of these organizers, 40 of these fellows, many of whom were without any stability at all in the community, and some of them not even living in the community, came there and raised all the clamor that was raised there that day, and then took advantage of the fact that there were 500 honest people there for an honest purpose, and spread the prearranged report throughout the country that there was an army of 500 people there crying for bread."

Further in his speech, on page 1884 of the Record of January 9, he uses this language:

"It was the workers in Little Rock that got up to England, in Arkansas, and it was the workers in Little Rock who sent out word, who sent out an Associated Press dispatch from Little Rock within less than an hour after these people began to assemble to receive their food."

My information is that these declarations are wholly untrue and without any foundation whatever, and as the paper indicated you spoke to those assembled there, I know of no one that could give more accurate information of the occurrence than yourself, and I will appreciate it very much if you will write me in full in regard to it, so the matter may be truthfully stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If you will permit, I will ask that your letter be read in Congress to give the true and correct statement of the conditions and of the people who participated in it.

My further information is that they were farmers who had been prosperous before this calamity of drought, and that the Red Cross had not up to the time they made this appeal been as active as possibly they should have been.

I will appreciate it very much if you will give me this letter, giving in full the actual conditions that prevail there and elsewhere in Arkansas, and I shall ask the permission of the floor to read the letter to Congress, so it may go into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and refute statements that it is the work of communists or Reds instead of actual conditions that have been brought about by the drought, as we who live there know to be the truth.

Your friend,

D. D. GLOVER.

I have just received a reply from this letter, dated January 14, 1931, and which reads as follows:

JANUARY 14, 1931.

Hon. D. D. GLOVER,

House Office Building, Room 142, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GLOVER: I am in receipt of your letter of January 10, asking me to either confirm or deny excerpts from Mr. Wood's speech, recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 9, at page 1884. Every word he uttered was false.

I spoke to the crowd of people on the streets of England on Saturday, the 3d day of January, and I positively know that there was no leader. The crowd was not at all threatening; merely asserting that their wives and babies were on starvation, completely without food, and if the merchants refused them food they would take it. The Red Cross had refused them assistance, so they said, and I am sure they told the truth. There was not a gun in the crowd of 500. Upon promise of food they disbanded and waited patiently for two hours, or until the merchants organized for distributing food cards.

I knew the crowd to whom I spoke. I have seen them for years. All of them were poor, illiterate Americans, having made share crops around England for years. They never heard that Russia had a revolution. Does Mr. Wood believe that you can buy a red for a sack of meal and a piece of meat?

Mr. Wood asserted that workers in Little Rock came to England and took advantage of the situation and sent out Associated Press dispatches from Little Rock within less than an hour after these people began to assemble to receive their food. There is no truth in that statement. I myself called the Associated Press and gave them all the facts. I did this simply to get the conditions of our poor people before the good people of America, since the Red Cross had refused them substantial aid, but claimed in Washington to the contrary.

I warned the Red Cross two months before the people assembled in England for food, that our share croppers would be on starvation in a short time, and its officials ignored my warning.

That you may forever eliminate the false impression that the red element had anything to do with this affair I gladly refer you to eminent men who have made personal investigation, namely, Col. J. F. Lucey (here yesterday), personal representative of President Hoover; Dr. William de Klein, health director; and Mr. Kinsley, representative of the Chicago Tribune.

You requested that I give you permission to read this letter to Congress. I do so.

With kindest personal regards, I remain, yours very truly,

GEO. E. MORRIS.

When Colonel Lucey made the public charge that Arkansas was lacking in leadership he showed as much lack of knowledge on that subject as he did about using Federal-aid funds for building rural roads in Arkansas.

He should be returned to Washington for further instructions. [Applause.]

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KOPP].

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, a few days ago the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], by reason of his promotion to the chairmanship of the Committee on Insular Affairs, tendered his resignation as chairman of the Committee on Pensions. For 10 years he presided over the Pension Committee. During that time he performed a great service, both for the country and for the veterans and their dependents. It was his constant purpose to be fair to the Nation and at the same time to be just to its defenders.

Those of us who served under Mr. KNUTSON on the Pension Committee know his true worth. We know his frankness and sincerity. We know his rugged honesty. We know his high sense of duty. During all the time that he was chairman of the Pension Committee he was never swayed by partisan considerations. He was never influenced by place or power. No man ever received greater consideration at his hands than the poorest and humblest veteran in all the land.

We who have been associated with Mr. KNUTSON deeply appreciate the splendid record he has made and it gives us much gratification to know that he will remain a member of the Pension Committee.

Mr. Chairman, in what I have stated I have voiced the sentiment of every member who served under Mr. KNUTSON. Every one is his warm, personal friend. Every one has for him the highest regard and esteem. Every one hopes that the people of his district will continue to reelect Mr. KNUTSON until he has served in this House as long as that distinguished Representative from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] and that distinguished Representative from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER]—yes; as long as the lamented "Uncle" Joe Cannon. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD].

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to compare the appropriation made for the Bureau of Statistics in the Department of Labor with the appropriation made for the Bureau of Prohibition in the Department of Justice, and I believe before we conclude considering this appropriation bill now before us, we should remedy what, in my judgment, is a very inconsistent position for Congress to take in connection with these two agencies of the Government.

On page 29 of the report we find that for the Bureau of Labor Statistics the bill carries for the next fiscal year \$440,480, which is \$2,820 under the Budget estimate, but \$79,500 over the 1931 appropriation. For the Bureau of Prohibition Enforcement we find the appropriation to be \$2,369,500 over the appropriation for the last fiscal year. We make no appropriation, however, for the Department of Labor to carry out the intent of the law enacted July 7 last and from now until July 1 next it will not be carried out.

This act, known as the Wagner law, authorizes the bureau to collect, report, and publish accurate information concerning unemployment in the United States. We nullify that act by our failure to appropriate funds to enable it to organize and function from now until the end of the present fiscal year. The appropriation for the Department of Labor, Bureau of Statistics, comes to us with the force of law behind it, and yet it is ignored. There is not a cent available for the organization of that bureau until the next fiscal year, and at that time a wholly inadequate amount is made available. On the other hand, with no force of law behind it, with only the request of the recently appointed Chief of the Prohibition Bureau, we increase the amount for enforcement of prohibition by upwards of \$2,000,000. This permits the appointment of 500 additional agents, and allows for an increase of the personnel in the local office by some 160 new

employees. On the one hand we approve without the force of law an increase in the personnel equal to 33 1/3 per cent, and on the other hand we completely ignore the will and intent of Congress. Some one well said that prohibition gets all the "breaks." Figuratively and literally that statement is true. While we have millions for prohibition, the \$40,000 necessary for the organization of this important function of the Government in the Department of Labor has no money whatever to carry on with until July 1 next. We have money for wire tapping, that vicious practice condemned and made a crime in 27 States of the Union, that practice termed "dirty business" by the courts of the United States, that practice condemned by Edgar Hoover, Chief of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, but sanctioned and provided for in the appropriation bill for the Bureau of Prohibition Enforcement.

We have \$160,000 for informers and stool pigeons, and not 1 cent for this labor measure. We have \$250,000 in this appropriation bill for the purchase of illicit liquor, for hotel bills and decoys in order that our people may be "framed" dragged into the courts and sent to jail. We have \$50,000 for posters, propaganda, and fallacious articles published in a vain attempt to sell this obnoxious law to the people of the country. We have money for the establishment of speak-easies by the Government and not any for this necessary agency which, until the first of July will have to go penniless. Mr. Ethelbert Stewart, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, when the Wagner bill became a law, began to organize his department, but when he found there were no funds available, he was forced to curtail that activity. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GLOVER] said a moment ago that we are too quick to condemn our people when they clamor for food, too quick to denounce them as reds. Yet by the inconsistent position we take, by the failure on the part of Congress to consider the wants and suffering of our people, we do more than any red could ever do to further that organization in this country, and I am one who is here to denounce communism. I hope that doctrine never finds lodgement in our beloved country. What we should do and what the committee ought to do before this bill goes to the Senate is to adopt an amendment making available immediately the sum of \$40,000 in order that the law passed in the last session of Congress might be put in force. After that is accomplished Congress ought to pass the other Wagner bills, because they are very necessary at this time. The press of the Nation, public opinion and the statesmanship of the country are united in support of these measures.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I have been informed that the bill we did pass and which is now in conference is about to come back to the House, that they have reached a compromise on it.

Mr. MEAD. Do you refer to the one I am discussing?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. No, there is another one in conference; the future planning bill, S. 3060, and I believe they are making some progress with it.

Mr. MEAD. I am happy to learn of the good news, and I hope the passage of the remaining bills will be expedited. We should pass all three of the Wagner bills and give the department sufficient appropriation to carry out their provisions. We will be doing the intelligent thing in this serious unemployment crisis, taking a better position than those who stand up and denounce the suffering people of Arkansas and other places as reds because they clamor for food and work.

It is the real purpose of government to see that the people enjoy life, happiness, and contentment, and where there is no food or work certainly there is no happiness, contentment, or enjoyment of life. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA].

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, just about the time that two young men from the State of Ohio startled the world

with a sustained flight in a heavier-than-air machine, the United States was startled by the dramatic action taken in this House in changing its time-worn rules. The event of aviation and the end of what was known as Cannonism came about the same time, but aviation has progressed a great deal since the first flight in the Wright biplane, while there has been very little, if any, change in the rules of this House.

Yesterday we heard a very interesting and instructive speech by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], who is acknowledged one of the best parliamentarians of this House. [Applause.] I am very glad that it was a Member of the standing of Judge CRISP and such a conservative gentleman that fired the first shot in the inevitable battle that is going to be fought on the floor of this House in the next Congress.

Some may believe that the suggestion yesterday contained in the proposed amendments to the rules is far-reaching and destructive of the orderly procedure of the House; but before you decide that question you must decide for yourselves the fundamental question whether you believe in parliamentary government. If you honestly and sincerely believe in parliamentary government, then no rule that gives a majority of the House the opportunity of expressing itself may consistently be opposed. As I understand our form of government, we have two branches of the Legislature, but it is quite possible under the restricted rules of either House that you may create three bodies—the Senate, the House, and a few individuals in the House who could have control of what Congress may consider.

If you believe in parliamentary government, if you believe in representative government, then any rule which permits the majority of this House to express itself, I repeat, can not honestly be opposed.

There is no difference in the certificates of election of Members of the House. Each one of us represents one congressional district, and all of us the people of the United States. We are all here on an equal footing; at least, it should be so. Therefore, rather than any one committee or any group of Members being able to control consideration of legislation, or even preventing consideration, it is quite in keeping with our theory of government and our philosophy of self-government that the rules of the House should be so as to provide that a majority of the House could at all times or at any time initiate legislation or otherwise regulate the conduct of the House.

Now, if it were suggested that a rule should be adopted giving a minority the power to bring in legislation, certainly sound, wholesome reasons might be urged against it.

I want to say to the gentleman from Georgia, and I want to repeat—not that I can add anything to the enlightening statement made by the gentleman from Georgia, but we must constantly repeat else there be misrepresentation made on the proposed changes in the rule, with resulting misunderstanding—that the 100 Members required to sign a petition is simply providing the machinery to move the bill to the full House for its decision as to whether the House desires to consider such bill. That is all. It simply brings a bill to the floor of the House, to decide by a majority vote if the bill is to be considered or not. Clearly, if a majority of the membership of the House expresses itself as being in favor of discharging a committee from further consideration of a bill and to take the bill up in the House, under the rules there can be no valid objection against a procedure of that kind, unless the Members are satisfied to openly confess, "I do not know what kind of legislation we should consider. Therefore I will delegate this discretion to a few of my colleagues."

I, for one, refuse.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. In just a moment I will.

I do not entirely agree with the second step in the procedure suggested by the gentleman from Georgia. Rather than go through unwieldy and perhaps cumbersome machinery of introducing a rule and then a second petition to discharge the Rules Committee, I would provide this, and I

submit it to the consideration of the membership of this House in the meantime, that when a majority votes to discharge a committee, thereupon any Member may move to consider that bill, to which motion a substitute motion may be made to put it on the calendar, and the House then and there proceeds to vote on the question; and if the House for a second time by a majority decides to consider the bill, it shall be the business of the day, fixed in the motion, and remain before this House until finally settled. No debate would be necessary for this motion. The House would have just heard all debate on the discharge motion and would best be able to decide then and there just when it would consider the bill on the merits.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. CRISP. I think the gentleman has a slight misunderstanding of the rule that I proposed. The real business end of the rule that will operate is when it is moved to discharge the Committee on Rules. You do not have two resolutions there. I introduce a resolution and it comes before the Committee on Rules. They will not report it. Then I move to discharge, and if that vote prevails, then under the rule, the House must immediately vote on the adoption of that resolution, and if they adopt it, then the House proceeds to consider the bill under the terms of the rule itself. I would eliminate the necessity of discharging the Rules Committee by submitting it to the House at any time after the discharge rule, whether they take it up then and there or fix a day to take it up, and the House having then voted to take it up on a fixed, definite day, it would remain before the House until disposed of.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I agree with the gentleman in his proposition and the rules of the next Congress ought to afford us that remedy, but what I have in mind is that practically every fundamental connected with the ideas of the gentleman from New York is diametrically in opposition to the views of this triumvirate he and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] both spoke so eloquently about, and how can he form a coalition with them?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I will answer that and I am coming to that. As I suggested to the gentleman from Georgia yesterday, this House adopts its own rules, and if this side of the House will vote for the rule suggested I am sure the gentleman from Georgia can rest assured that there will be enough votes on this side to adopt the rule. That is all there is to that. [Applause.]

With reference to the rule suggested by the gentleman from Georgia for the meeting of the committee, I want to respectfully suggest to him just one slight modification. That when that petition is signed by a majority of the Members a copy of the petition itself be mailed to every member of the committee, and that to constitute a call for the meeting. That will obviate any danger of a recalcitrant clerk refusing or failing to send out the notice of the meeting. The signing of the petition by a majority of the members of the committee and a majority of the committee attending the meeting will constitute a quorum, and they can legally proceed to do business.

Now, gentlemen, I have another idea for liberalizing the rules, and I hope no Member will feel hurt at what I shall state. The greatest medium of expressing the wishes of this House—and I say this after 12 years of experience—is for every Member to attend the sessions of Congress, to remain in his seat, and vote according to his beliefs. That is the best rule you can have. If 435 Members attend to their legislative duties and attend sessions of Congress when bills are being considered, I do not care what kind of rules we have. The majority can always impose its will on any matter at any time.

The two parliamentary procedures I want to commend to the new Members of the next Congress are these: The power of voting down a previous question and taking control of the question then under consideration. Why this House refuses to vote down a previous question is more than I can

understand, because that in itself is one of the greatest weapons this House can have. Vote down the previous question and it opens the doors to further amendments or to amendments to any rule that the Rules Committee might bring in. Refuse to adjourn the House at the end of the day and continue to do business if legislation is moving too slow. Let the majority be on the job and willing to vote its will, and I do not care what kind of rules we may have. I wonder often if Members do not alibi themselves behind the rules when pretending to be for certain legislation and not really for it, or in a desire to avoid a vote on a highly controversial subject.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. CRISP. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman, but that only furnishes half a remedy. Suppose there is non-action? Suppose the Committee on Rules will not bring in any kind of a rule? How are you going to get up a non-privileged bill under such circumstances?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I am assuming we are going to adopt the discharge rule.

Mr. CRISP. I was speaking of the present time. However, with that discharge rule there is no trouble about doing business.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I do not see why, when the previous question is moved, it is simply accepted as a matter of course, a few just saying aye and no one saying no. That, coupled with attendance upon sessions of the House, is a very important proposition. The other day there were 101 Members absent on a motion to recommit an appropriation bill. I believe it is not an unreasonable suggestion, when we are discussing the rules of the House, to also suggest attention to legislative duties in full attendance when the House is considering legislation. That, of course, would not apply to field days under general debate not limited to the bill.

I feel this way about it: It was never intended, I am sure, that there should be a sort of censorship or an extraterritorial committee passing upon the legislative program. I will concede that perhaps, under a liberalization of the rules, hasty and ill-advised legislation may be passed. I will concede that. But I firmly believe that the giving of the power of expression on the part of a majority of the representatives of the American people will not be as harmful as permitting a few individuals to control the legislation of Congress. [Applause.] That being so, it seems to me there should be no hesitancy in adopting the slight amendments which will surely be offered and considered at the next session of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman has given some study to a revision of the rules. Has the gentleman given any thought to the question of Calendar Wednesday, and how it fails to go clear through the list? For the gentleman's information, I would like to say that the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, has not been called on Calendar Wednesday since April 5, 1922, and is not likely to be called in another two or three years. Yet we have many bills of a minor nature on the calendar which are nearly always subject to objection on the part of one or two persons.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I was thinking about that, and perhaps instead of giving two successive Calendar Wednesdays to a committee we might give one and then run through the whole list. I think that would be helpful.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman can see how it destroys the efficiency of a committee, when the members of it know objections will be made to nearly every bill it may report and put on the calendar.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I trust the gentleman is not looking at me when he makes that statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am looking at many Members of this House who have introduced bills and who are writing to the committee asking why the committee does not report their bills.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I am sure the gentleman understands the purpose of the Consent Calendar. It is the greatest medium for rushing through bills that are noncontroversial and over which there is no difference of opinion. But to meet the gentleman's suggestion it might be well to have a committee given one Calendar Wednesday instead of two Calendar Wednesdays and enable the whole list to be taken care of. If that were done and a committee is well prepared with its bills, there is no reason why it can not dispose of a great many of them. And, of course, a committee should be able to attract sufficient interest in the bills it reports to keep a quorum present as long as it may take to dispose of the business it has on its calendar day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Then we should understand that each time we postpone Calendar Wednesday in the early part of a session we are depriving a large number of Members who are on the nonprivileged committees of any right to have their legislation considered.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. There is no question about that; and I am sure that if the gentleman, who has so much influence in this House, will come forward with a modification of the rules the House will be in a temper to consider it.

Mr. CRISP. May I say more in answer to what the gentleman from Washington has said that under the rules of the House Calendar Wednesday is sought to be made sacred. The Committee on Rules can not report a rule dispensing with it and it can not be dispensed with except by a two-thirds vote of the House to dispense with Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Right along that line, some time ago I tried to organize the chairmen and the members of the nonprivileged committees in order to bring this matter before the House. I must have brought it to an issue at an unfortunate time, because I was voted down and since then, to my knowledge, there have been 100 postponements of Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Now, there is another suggestion which I believe deserves some thought. When a demand for a roll call is made and a division is asked, I believe that some measure should be provided whereby a teller vote could automatically be had. Of course, every one knows that in the rush at the end of a day it sometimes is not very easy to count accurately. I am not saying that any inaccurate count has ever been made in this House, but in order to avoid any inaccuracies in the future, I believe that where a demand for a roll call is made, which is constitutional, that on a division vote any Member may ask for tellers and the tellers are automatically ordered. This is certainly a reasonable suggestion that no fair-minded man could object to.

I do not believe in the system of dodging a vote. Our term was purposely fixed for a short time of two years in order to leave the control in the hands of the people, and I still believe in that. This being so, no Member should want to avoid responsibility on any vote, and worse things could happen in the world than being defeated for standing up and voting for what one believes is right. Let each Member be ready to face his legislative responsibility. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Igoe].

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, there appears an article in the Washington Post of this morning, January 17, 1931, in which Bishop Edwin D. Mouzon, of the Southern Methodist Church, one of the Democrats who opposed Alfred E. Smith in 1928 on the wet-dry issue, in which he sharply criticized President Hoover for his attitude on the prohibition question and also took a shot at the Wickersham Law Enforcement Commission, saying:

It was time to take prohibition out of the hands of politicians and putting it back in the hands of its friends.

He recalled the commission had been charged with being a "kite flier" for the President, and asserted that in the charge there is apparently "much truth."

On the same day, Mr. F. Scott McBride, general superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League, attending a meeting of the trustees of the North Carolina State League, said:

Believing that prohibition enforcement is now in the hands of its friends, President Hoover is backing up the enforcement by putting it in charge of efficient men who are interested in prohibition itself.

A charge has been made by one of the leaders of the dry movement that the wets are hopelessly divided on any substitute to replace prohibition should the eighteenth amendment be repealed. The public, I am sure, is convinced that it will not take the wets 11 years to work out a solution of the liquor problem that will be far superior to the present prohibition law.

It has been reported in the press that the Wickersham report is in the President's hands, and he is about to write a message to Congress. I hope the message will contain instructions to Congress to immediately modify the Volstead Act, thereby displaying the kind of leadership the country is looking for.

Recently there appeared in the Chicago Tribune a cartoon of Uncle Sam nailing up a sign requesting a leader to guide the destinies of these United States. This opportunity is knocking at the door not only of the White House but of the Supreme Court. They can, if they will, hand down a decision with just two words, "Decision affirmed." The decision to which reference is made is that handed down recently by Judge Clark, of New Jersey, in which he stated the prohibition law and the eighteenth amendment were not constitutional. Immediately an end would be put to the dole system that we are putting out through camouflage of appropriations, the farmers' relief, and the drought-relief appropriations.

Within 24 hours after such a decision is handed down by the Supreme Court every industry in the United States would supply employment in preparing for the wave of prosperity that would necessarily follow. France and other foreign countries would immediately establish a credit of millions of dollars in New York and within 10 days would be shipping from their ports some of the rare wines, and Germany would ship boatloads of Munich beer while the breweries of this country were preparing to supply the demand for good wholesome beverages.

This decision would be beneficial to the farmer as well as it would be to the manufacturer. Thousands upon thousands of men would be employed in the breweries and every other allied industry. If that cartoon has any significance to it, now is the time for that leadership to be displayed by members of the Supreme Court and the President. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANKFORD].

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am receiving several letters making inquiry about the Farm Board and its activities, and also making certain inquiries about the cooperative associations in my State through which the Farm Board functions.

I therefore wish to make another brief statement concerning my position on the farm marketing act recently passed by Congress. I have been opposed to the present plan ever since it was first suggested several years ago. It was originated during the Coolidge administration and was finally passed during the present administration with only a few variations.

It is not my purpose to discuss the plan in detail at this time. I have done this rather fully heretofore and hope to do so again at a more opportune time. Neither is it my intention to suggest the changes in the law which I favor to bring about what, to my mind, is a proper solution of the farm problem. I have a bill pending for this purpose which I have discussed many times, and which I will continue to discuss until I leave Congress, unless the farm problem is satisfactorily solved in the meantime.

Mr. Chairman, I criticized the present so-called farm-relief plan much more before it became law than since. While I have always believed that the act had failure written on its pages, I have hoped that I was mistaken and that

it would be of some real value. Of course, I realize that the Farm Board will be helpful, to some extent, to the farmers of the country, but at the same time I feel that we should have passed a bill containing an effective marketing and production control scheme. I can not bring myself to believe that the help that will come from this legislation will be at all commensurate with the enormous cost of the experiment. Then, again, we are only delaying real farm-relief legislation while the farmers are losing all that they have ever owned in a financial way. The experiment is expensive, is bound to become a failure, and may prove to be very dangerous.

I very much fear that those farmers who survive the present crisis will stagger from the wreckage of the present farm-marketing scheme with all their hopes blasted and will be too demoralized to expect anything else in the way of farm relief, and that those who oppose real farm relief will take advantage of the situation and contend that one trial has been made and that there is no use in endeavoring to work out a real marketing act. Then, again, I very much fear that there will be efforts to try out some other plans that are as bad or worse than the one we are now trying. Among others, I am referring to the old equalization fee plan, which would not only be a failure but would really be criminal.

I repeat, I hope I am mistaken and that the present act will prove itself to be of more value than I have anticipated. I certainly want the Farm Board to have an opportunity to give the plan a fair trial. If it is to become a failure I want all the country to be able to see its defects and no one to say that a monkey wrench was thrown into the machinery and that adverse criticisms blocked the board in their efforts.

For all these reasons I do not want anyone to understand me as criticizing the board. I am not criticizing the board or their acts. I am criticizing the act itself and I am criticizing Congress for failing to pass real farm-relief legislation.

I trust that the Farm Board keeps a close check on the activities of the various cooperative associations and that any irregularities in these associations are remedied and that everything possible be done to make the act a success. Let us make it a success if possible and if we can not make it a success let us find it out as soon as possible and then pass such legislation as is necessary to put in full force and effect a plan that will work.

We have a powerful board, but no real progress is being made. For instance, the board can use the money at its command to temporarily raise or lower the price of wheat in this country. In fact, with an embargo on wheat and with sufficient money the board can run the price of wheat in this country to \$5 per bushel. The wheat farmer would be helped with this year's crop, but can the board afford to continue to buy wheat at a loss to the Government with no control over the production of wheat and no control over the marketing of the wheat except to buy at an artificial price and store at a loss to the rest of the country. In the end the wheat farmer is bound to lose every dollar he thinks he is now gaining unless the rest of the country wants to make an outright donation to the wheat farmer each year. If we are going to do this why not simply pay a bounty of so much per bushel on wheat. Everyone must see the fallacy of the present plan.

The whole trouble lies in the inability of the board to control production.

There are several other fatal defects with the plan. I shall content myself at this time with mentioning only the one to which I have just referred.

To my way of thinking, Congress has built a mighty locomotive, placed it on its side, half buried in mud, without any rails or throttle, and expects the Farm Board, as its engineers, with plenty of coal and water but no additional help, to make 70 miles per hour.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say I do not blame anyone for the failure of the present Farm Board act except

those responsible for its provisions, the Congress of the United States.

There are many of us who are anxious to pass real farm relief legislation, but we will be a long time doing so unless we can get more help than we have ever received in the past.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, in a speech on the floor of the House January 6 I brought to the attention of the Members of this body the facts concerning the operation of an unlawful speak-easy set up by agents of the Department of Justice to entrap members of the Police Department of Indianapolis in prohibition cases. In that connection I read into the RECORD letters from Col. Amos W. W. Woodcock, Director of the Prohibition Bureau of the Department of Justice, admitting that funds of the Federal Government were used to rent these premises.

The facts in this case appear to demonstrate that the Department of Prohibition, since its transfer from the Treasury to the Department of Justice, has resumed the practice of setting up speak-easies for the entrapment of public officials and citizens which was abandoned several years ago by the Prohibition Bureau of the Treasury Department. The Senate exposed the practice of the Prohibition Bureau in 1926 in the Norfolk, Va., and the New York speak-easy cases. The facts in those two cases, as revealed in Senate Document No. 198 of the Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, were so abhorrent to the practices of sound and honest government that the Prohibition Unit of the Treasury Department was forced by the power of outraged public opinion to abandon them. It was shown, particularly in the Norfolk cases, that a representative of the Anti-Saloon League influences the prohibition enforcement department to send agents to Norfolk to set up a negro speak-easy and that these agents employed negro spies to operate the speak-easy and spy upon the police of Norfolk and the sheriffs of near-by counties, both in Virginia and North Carolina.

Almost identical methods were employed in Indianapolis where negro stool pigeons were again employed by the Prohibition Bureau of the Department of Justice to spy upon and entrap members of the Indianapolis Police Department.

Since 1923 the Presidents of the United States and the higher officials of the prohibition enforcement department have been making appeal after appeal to the State officials for closer cooperation in the enforcement of the prohibition law. They have begged the governors of the States to take the principal burden off the shoulders of the Federal Government. They have pleaded that the force of the Federal Government is pitifully inadequate to enforce the prohibition laws. They have confessed that the Federal Government can not do the job. They want the police departments, the sheriffs, and the police officers of the States do the work undertaken by the Federal Government.

Yet the Federal Government outrages local public officials by setting up unlawful speak-easies, operated by negro spies, to entrap these local officials into a violation of the prohibition law so that they may be railroaded to the penitentiary. If you will read some of the letters of the agents in the Norfolk case, printed in the Senate Document No. 198, you will see that they were deliberately trying, to use their own language, to "jam" the members of the police department of that city. That is probably what they were doing in Indianapolis by resorting to the same methods used in Norfolk.

It was developed in the Norfolk cases that the agents of the prohibition enforcement department, sent there by the influence of and at the solicitation of the Anti-Saloon League, and who were working under its direction, were frequently in a high state of intoxication. And yet their evidence was used to cause the removal from office of members of the police force of Norfolk and sheriffs of adjoining or near-by counties, and also to cause them to be prosecuted on charges of violation of the prohibition law.

I can think of no more effective means of discouraging the cooperation of State, county, and municipal officials in the enforcement of the national prohibition law than by the process of setting up unlawful speak-easies to inveigle them into the violation of the prohibition law for the purpose of bringing about their indictment and prosecution.

In this connection I desire to bring to the attention of the Members of the House other practices of the Federal prohibition enforcement department which are upon the borderland of the unlawful, if not actually unlawful.

I hold in my hand a copy of what purports to be "a factual outline of Federal and State responsibility" in the enforcement of the national prohibition law, issued by the Bureau of Prohibition of the Treasury Department a short time before its transfer to the Department of Justice. This book is entitled "State Cooperation." It is a plea for better cooperation between the States and the Federal Government in prohibition enforcement. It shows that the State governments are so much better equipped to enforce the prohibition laws that I am surprised that anybody should deem it necessary to have a Federal prohibition law. It shows that there are 200,000 State and local officers who could help enforce prohibition throughout the United States, and that the Federal Government has less than 2,000 field men available for the work. It is clearly a plea for the State and local governments to take over practically the entire job of prohibition enforcement.

I propose to show you that in this booklet the agents of the Federal prohibition enforcement bureau are encouraged and instigated to cooperate with State and local officials to violate the plain and emphatic provisions of the Federal Constitution and statutes. They are told to do things in conjunction with State and local officials which, if they did as Federal officials, would bring them within the range of the Federal statutes and subject them to severe punishment. They are told to do things which are a violation of the Federal Constitution.

I now quote from page 29 of the factual monograph entitled "State Cooperation," from a chapter captioned "Laws of Search and Seizure":

In general—

Says the monograph—

the States have more liberal provisions in their search and seizure laws than the United States. This is due to the historical development of the writ, which puts many restraints upon Federal officers that do not apply to State officials.

Amendment IV is jealously guarded by both Federal and State courts. State officers may exercise a much wider latitude in search and seizure proceedings than Federal officers.

There are broadly three classes of search and seizure laws:

1. The Federal law. This makes a search warrant a highly technical writ. It will issue only upon an affidavit based on probable cause, in which it must be set forth with clearness the description and location of the premises to be searched, the things to be seized, and the reasons the declarer may have for believing that the warrant should be issued.

Should the warrant be in the least technically deficient, any evidence secured under it is not admissible in a forthcoming trial.

2. State laws that permit the issue of search warrants in much the same manner, except that if the warrant is defective the evidence is admissible.

3. State laws that allow the issue of the writ upon information and belief. These laws do not require detailed information upon which to base a warrant. The majority of the State laws of search are of this nature. They allow the search of vehicles and many places without warrants, simply on reasonable assurances of a reliable officer that the law is being violated.

Briefly, the Federal law of search and seizure is (act of June 15, 1917, 40 Stat. 228 et seq.):

"Sec. 3. A search warrant can not be issued except upon probable cause supported by an affidavit naming and describing the person and particularly describing the property and the place to be searched.

"Sec. 5. The affidavit must set forth the facts to establish the grounds of the application or probable cause for believing they exist.

"Sec. 15. If the grounds on which the warrant was issued are controverted, the judge or the commissioner must proceed to take testimony in relation thereto, and the testimony of each witness must be reduced to writing and subscribed by each witness."

TYPICAL STATE SEARCH AND SEIZURE LAW

Few of the States have anything like as stringent laws of search and seizure as this. As typical of the more liberal laws of the States is that of Nebraska (Laws of 1921, ch. 156, sec. 7):

"If any officer of the county or State or any creditable resident of the county makes a complaint before any city, county, or State judge, or justice of the peace, in writing, and on oath, that he has reason to believe, and does believe, that any intoxicating liquor is in the county in any place described, and unlawfully owned or kept by any person as described, or is intended to be sold, or is being manufactured, sold, or kept for sale, in violation of this act, said magistrate shall issue a warrant for the search of the premises described."

Evidence secured, though the warrant be defective, will be admissible; the person whose place was searched must prove that the liquor was lawfully in his possession. That it was in his possession is prima facie evidence that he had it for the purpose of illegal sale.

Again, it is pointed out that with State and Federal officers cooperating sincerely, more beneficial results will be obtained by reason of the wider latitude of authority given to State officers. When these officers work together, transportation, for example, can be wholly stopped, as the State officers in most States have the widest authority in searching vehicles without warrants. The same applies to speak-easies and illicit stills even in dwellings, for while Federal officers must have evidence of sale before getting a warrant, State officials can enter with a warrant based on information and belief.

The foregoing instruction is a clear and emphatic order to Federal prohibition agents to work with State officials to do things that are unlawful under the Federal Constitution and Statutes. It is an instruction to them to instigate State officers, under what are described liberal laws of search and seizure, to search vehicles without warrants, to raid dwellings merely upon information and belief, and to use as evidence against the citizen information obtained upon a warrant that would be unlawful under Federal law, and which, under Federal law, could not be used.

It is an instruction to Federal prohibition agents to work with State officials to destroy the rights of citizens which have been jealously guarded ever since the ratification of the fourth amendment to the Federal Constitution, which rights have been safeguarded time and time again by both the Federal and State courts.

If a Federal prohibition agent, hand in glove with a State officer, can undermine the constitutional rights of the citizen by merely acting under tyrannical State prohibition laws, then one of the bulwarks of the Bill of Rights has been completely destroyed. All that a Federal agent has to do when he finds that he does not have sufficient evidence to justify the issuance of a warrant under Federal law and procedure is to go to a local official and influence him to act, under a loose search and seizure State law. Then the right of the citizen to the protection of the Federal Constitution is swept away. He is fined or imprisoned under a procedure that is unlawful under the laws and the Constitution of the United States. Evidence that would be rejected under the Federal Constitution and statutes would be used under State laws, at the instigation of the agents provocateurs of the Federal Government, to send a man to prison, even though he be entitled to the full protection of that Constitution.

The fourth amendment to the Constitution reads:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the person or things to be seized.

Every State, county, and municipal officer in the United States is required to take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. They are as much bound by the Constitution of the United States as are the Federal officers.

But we find the Federal prohibition enforcement department instructing its agents to enter into conspiracies with the State, county, and municipal officers to influence them to violate the Constitution.

When Federal prohibition agents cooperate with State prohibition agents to execute searches and seizures under State warrants that are invalid under the Federal law they are undoubtedly guilty of searching the premises of the citizen without a warrant. I have little doubt that such Federal agents, and officials of the Federal prohibition enforcement bureau who instruct them to make such unlawful searches and seizures, could be punished under the provisions of the act of November 23, 1921, which reads:

Any officer, agent, or employee of the United States engaged in the enforcement of title 27 (the national prohibition act) or any other law of the United States, who shall search any private dwelling, as defined in title 27 (national prohibition act), and occupied as such dwelling, without a warrant directing the search, or who while so engaged shall without a search warrant maliciously and without reasonable cause search any other building or property, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined for a first offense not more than \$1,000, and for a subsequent offense not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both such fine and imprisonment.

It is a criminal offense for any Federal officer to search any home without a search warrant. But note the instructions to the Federal prohibition agents by the Prohibition Bureau:

When these officers [Federal and State] work together, transportation, for example, can be wholly stopped, as State officers in most States have the widest authority in searching vehicles without warrants. The same applies to speak-easies and even in dwellings, for while Federal officers must have evidence of sale before getting a warrant, State officials can enter with a warrant based on information and belief.

The Federal prohibition agent may have merely a suspicion of a belief that there is liquor in the home of a citizen. Under the Federal prohibition act he can not get a warrant because he has no proof of sale. But he can go to the State officer and influence him to get a warrant on suspicion or belief, and he can accomplish by conspiracy or connivance a thing that violates both the Federal Constitution and statutes. The instructions to the agents in this volume on State cooperation amount to nothing less than an instruction to violate the Federal Constitution by indirection or evasion whenever it pleases them to do so. It amounts to a conspiracy against the citizen, a deliberate attempt to unlawfully deprive him of his property or his liberty, to fasten upon him the brand of a criminal, to put him into a penitentiary, from which he will issue with the everlasting disgrace of an ex-convict hanging over his head, to the degradation of himself, his family, and his children.

The people of the United States are being continuously told by the President and by the officials of the Prohibition Bureau, by the so-called moral reformers and their spokesmen in Congress, that they must obey and respect the national prohibition law and the eighteenth amendment. But they do not respect other vital provisions of the Federal Constitution.

They beg the State governments to enforce the prohibition law, to relieve the Federal Government of a job that it has undertaken. They admit that the enforcement job is too big for the Federal Government. They know they can not enforce it. Their only hope is to get the States to do a thing that is the work of the Federal Government.

They instruct the Federal agents to induce the State agents to violate the Federal Constitution and statutes in order to raid the homes of the citizen. It is always the citizen who is the victim of the conspiracy. His rights are to be destroyed by any sort of device that can land him in jail. If the officers of the State, viewing the prohibition mess as disreputable, reject the pleas of the Federal Government to enter into the conspiracy to destroy the rights of the citizen, then what happens?

The Federal Government proceeds to violate the law by setting up a speak-easy to entrap the police officer or the sheriff or the constable, so that he can be put in jail. His offense may be that he will not enter into a conspiracy with the Federal agent to violate the law so that the citizen may be deprived of his liberty. Then he must pay the penalty.

With money taken out of the Treasury of the United States the speak-easy is set in operation. The agents violate the prohibition law by stocking it with liquor. The negro spy or informer is set on the job to inveigle the policemen into the trap. The State, county, or municipal official is this time the prey of the spies and the informers. The agents, as shown by the record in the Norfolk case, hold high revel. They get beastly drunk. They keep appointments with women of doubtful reputation. They are out to "jam" the police. Some of the spies they employ are so

disreputable that they are compelled to keep them out of court.

The trap is sprung. The policemen, or the sheriff, or the other local officer is indicted upon the evidence manufactured in the speakeasy, in conspiracy with the negro spies and informers. The testimony of this ilk is accepted in the courts. The policemen are convicted. In the Indianapolis case some were sentenced to three years imprisonment.

The Federal Government is in effect saying to the State and local officers, that you must cooperate with us so that we can do things that are unlawful under the Federal Constitution and laws, and if you will not do it, then we will entrap you and put you in jail. Will you join us in the conspiracy to deprive the citizen of the protection of the constitutional guarantees that have been his ever since the right to a Constitution was won on the battlefields of the Revolution, or will you stand with the citizen and become yourself the victim of the Federal Government's unlawful entrapment?

In either case, it is a most disgraceful procedure. The end of Government, as we understood it before the adoption of the eighteenth amendment and the enforcement act, was to protect the citizen in all his constitutional rights. The end of government now seems to be, by hook or crook, to destroy the constitutional rights of the citizen that existed before the adoption of the eighteenth amendment, so that he can be jailed.

What are the States answering to the pleas, the admonitions of the Federal Government for cooperation to enforce the prohibition? The people of three States replied directly at the polls in November. Their answer was emphatic.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts withdrew all cooperation from the Federal Government in the enforcement of the prohibition law by repealing its State enforcement act by a vote of 641,967 to 367,165. Rhode Island, by a vote of 171,215 to 48,845, declared that it wanted nothing more to do with the eighteenth amendment.

The people of Illinois, by a vote of 1,035,690 to 514,579, instructed their representatives in the State legislature to repeal the State enforcement act, and withdraw all support from the Federal Government in the enforcement of this obnoxious law.

The people of these three States answered the Federal Government's plea for cooperation in no uncertain language. The combined vote of the three States against further cooperation was 1,848,872, while the vote in favor of further cooperation was only 930,322. Wherever the people are consulted directly at the polls their answer is 2 to 1 against cooperation.

The people of Illinois, by almost the same vote, instructed their Representatives and Senators in Congress to vote for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment and the national prohibition law.

It sometimes takes the truth a long time to get back home. But when the people in their homes learn that you Representatives in Congress are voting money to perpetuate the unlawful cooperative conspiracy between the Federal and State governments to deprive them of their liberties, and that you are voting their money to set up unlawful speakeasies to entrap their policemen and sheriffs, and that you are employing disreputable drunken spies to unlawfully deprive their public officials of their offices and destroy their good names by sending them to prison, then they are going to rebel. There are going to be more seats occupied in this House by Representatives who will protect the constitutional rights of the individual citizens and the rights of the State, county, and municipal officials. [Applause.]

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., December 10, 1930

HON. J. CHARLES LINTHICUM,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to extend to you my sincere congratulations on your stand in reference to the Indianapolis policemen's case. We need more men of your courage in our national legislative body.

I do not know from the information published in the press whether or not you knew that in September of this year there were two indictments charging conspiracy returned against Indianapolis policemen. In one indictment 11 police officers were charged with

conspiracy. This indictment was worked up by a number of Government undercover men, headed by one Mr. Henderson, a convict who is now enjoying liberty on a suspended sentence for larceny. In the other case seven Indianapolis policemen were indicted as a result of the acts of Government agents in renting and equipping a pool room and placing in charge of said room a notorious negro character, whom the Government was unable to produce at the time of the trial.

Evidence was submitted that this negro and these agents on several different occasions approached numerous policemen and endeavored by persuasion and deception to induce them to take a drink of liquor or accept some gratuity. The acts of the Government in this case were most reprehensible, and deserve a most complete and thorough airing.

If I can be of any assistance or service in giving you information, please command me.

Very truly yours,

WILBUR A. ROYSE,
Attorney for Defendant Policemen.

CHICAGO, ILL., January 14, 1931.

HON. REPRESENTATIVE LINTHICUM,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE DEAR SIR: I notice that you have directed a letter to Prohibition Director Woodcock informing him that funds were being used by the Prohibition Department to establish speakeasies and liquor dispensing stations, established for the purpose of inducing different citizens and police throughout different parts of the country. In the particular instance you quoted that it opened a liquor dispensing station at 1213 East Twenty-second Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

If you will make a careful check-up of the Illinois department you will find that they have established similar speak-easies in various parts of the city of Chicago, and in the State of Illinois, especially at Peoria, Ill. I understand the Government paid \$6,000 to buy a speakeasy and establish an elaborate bar and barroom wherein they engaged in the liquor traffic for a considerable length of time in order to entrap some officials from that town and district. The same has been done in many cases in Chicago, and you are unquestionably right in charging that a great deal, if not most, of said money is being used to establish liquor dispensing establishments for entrapping public officials.

I believe you can do a great service in the particular matter by offering an amendment making it illegal to obtain any evidence obtained by any trick or device, scheme or plan wherein the Government seeks, either directly or indirectly, to entrap citizens into violation of the prohibition laws; and make the amendment to the prohibition law so drastic as to make this practice impossible.

Wishing you success in your work in this particular matter, I am,

Yours very truly,

A. O'CONNOR.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, this masterpiece is being delivered in the eleventh year of prohibition and the second year of Herbert Hoover. The theme song of the era is You're Driving Me Crazy. We have had 11 years of corruption, waste, bigotry, brutality, racketeering, and revolt. Terrible to be said, but we live in the dark days of the engineer and the experiment. The people would welcome an experienced politician in place of the experimental engineer.

The holy rollers of prohibition are now celebrating their 11 years of reform by rough-house, and Al Capone is still doing business at the same old stand. The Statue of Liberty has been taken for a ride and the Declaration of Independence has been put on the spot. The Anti-Saloon League promised a paradise, and they produced it for bootleggers and bandits.

A dry depressionist desponds in the White House and he feels sure the worst is yet to come. We have a President with a hair shirt on his back and a public with no shirts on theirs.

We throw men out of jobs in navy yards, arsenals, and post offices, but we add to the jobs in the Prohibition Bureau. We throw skilled mechanics out of work, but we employ stool pigeons, wire tappers, and informers.

The Congressmen from the Northwest let the eastern farmers turn their apples into applejack and the California farmers turn their grapes into wine, but they will not let their own farmers turn their barley, hops, and corn into beer. Under prohibition the fruits trump the grains.

You would not give the city poor or the country poor \$15,000,000 to keep from starving, but you are giving \$11,-

000,000 to prohibition as a birthday present for the Anti-Saloon League.

Again the Congress is about to waste millions of the people's money on a law the people do not want; yet they call us Representatives. The eighteenth amendment is a dead letter, just as in some places are the fourteenth and fifteenth. We wink at violations of the fourteenth and fifteenth, but we throw fits over violations of the eighteenth.

The Congress that passed the eighteenth amendment did not include purchasers as violators, thus plainly indicating that, as far as morals were concerned, there was nothing so reprehensible about drinking. This has been followed up in the personal habits of a great number of legislators who spend the public money to put men in jail who sell them rum. No law in history has staggered like prohibition.

The public has no conscience about the eighteenth amendment and we have no conscience about the public money. There is a revolt against prohibition, for Americans, being practical, are not content to wait for a repeal that can be prevented by 13 States. The public makes its own liquor laws, and, sad to say, sometimes its own liquor. If we keep on wasting public taxes on prohibition there will soon be a revolt against the income tax law, for the public will not pay taxes for their own oppression.

The Constitution was never intended as an engine of government to be driven over our people. It was a machine to protect the States from outside powers. So the States gave to the Federal Government, their agent in dealing with foreign governments, taxing power, so that the agent, through an Army and Navy, could enforce contracts known as treaties with outside powers. The Constitution was to have an objective purpose and was not intended for subjective regulation. The amendment perverted this theory, and so naturally the people are restive under the Constitution. Congressional government has lost popular respect because of such ridiculous appropriations as are set forth in the pending bill.

We are trying to find out all we can about a commission that is trying to find out what it's all about. Without waiting for the report of the Wickersham commission and having no respect for our creature, this ugly duckling of government, we go ahead and appropriate over \$11,000,000 for prohibition enforcement. Why is there not some one to coordinate the activities of the administration. Why does not the committee wait until Wickersham reports? Why not leave these controversial items aside until the sleeping beauty wakes up, and take care of them in a deficiency bill?

There is no doubt about the farcical character of prohibition. It was to end saloons. Well, a speak-easy is only an unlicensed, poorly ventilated saloon with rotten rum, high prices, and a few hostesses on the side.

Mr. Charles Merz, of the New York World, sums up his scholarly and trustworthy treatise on prohibition called the "Dry Decade" in this wise:

National prohibition by constitutional amendment had begun as the golden dream of thousands of devoted men and women. At the end of a decade, it had precipitated a struggle which was to test the political wisdom of the American Republic.

The Democratic Party, following the principles of Jefferson and Wilson and the leadership of Smith and Raskob, is a liberal party. I shall move in the Democratic caucus, that the Democratic Members of Congress pledge themselves to a repeal of the eighteenth amendment. I trust the liberals in the Republican caucus will force their leaders to show their hands. They could also force out Lucas and his revival of bigotry. I notice some former Democrats are again taking up the cry of the klan. An extinguished Senator said that Raskob did not know the difference between a Democrat and a mule. Well, I know the Senator is no Democrat. I think the liberals in both parties should in the coming caucuses force the leadership to provide for roll calls in the next session on the various phases of prohibition. Let us get a line-up on the question so that the public can proceed accordingly.

The dregs from the rural districts, having no strong political machines, fear in the direct primaries the evangelical churches which are the only organized political forces, but

the churches in the rural districts get their support from the farmers. The churches will stop being political bosses and turn again to theology when the farmers realize that a great part of their economic troubles come from prohibition. [Applause.]

It is worthy of note that prohibition got its initial economic impetus in the Lever food control bill under an amendment offered by Mr. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, on June 23, 1917. The great demands for grains for food during the war brought about, to a big extent, war prohibition as a food-conservation proposition. Then the Volstead Act prevented a readjustment when the demand for American grain foods ended with the war. Food that was needed due to the war could not be turned to beverages due to prohibition. The farmer lost his foreign war market, and did not get back his brewery and distillery markets. Farm experts, instead of stressing the disaster due to the loss of markets through the artificial means of prohibitory legislation, insist on the artifice of price-fixing through socialistic legislation to make up the losses. One costly lobbied legislative measure is to be solved by additional error similarly stimulated.

Recent reports from the Department of Agriculture and the Prohibition Bureau indicate that prohibition has been a monumental gold brick for the American farmer.

The Prohibition Bureau reports that the tax on distilled spirits for 1919 was \$365,211,252.26, and on fermented liquors \$117,839,602.21; and in 1927 on distilled spirits \$21,194,668.71, and on fermented liquors \$883.25. There has been an increasing loss in the intervening years. Moreover, national enforcement has required appropriations of about \$100,000,000, and against which approximately \$40,000,000 has been collected in fines and penalties. The farmers, of course, bear a considerable portion of this tax loss and appropriations cost. This is not considering the losses by the States, and it is to the taxes of the States that the farmers are the heaviest contributors. The farm bill proposes to add to the tax burden of the country \$400,000,000.

COST OF PROHIBITION

The New York World on October 24, 1927, published an article by Henry F. Pringle, giving the voters on the New York State referendum facts to be considered. The article reads:

Loss of taxes and license fees, salaries of army enforcement officers, destruction of industries, graft, and new crimes some of facts voters must consider.

Under the caption "The Cost" the article reads:

The cost of prohibition can properly be called as follows: (1) Expenditures of Federal Government for Prohibition Unit and other agencies concerned with enforcement; (2) expenditures of States and cities for enforcement; (3) loss of revenue received before prohibition from excise taxes and import duties; (4) loss to States and cities in former license fees; (5) loss to the Nation in the destruction of industries once engaged in the manufacture of liquors and beer.

Against this bill must be placed the estimates of the savings caused by prohibition. These, according to the estimates of the prohibitionists, have more than made up the cost.

CITY POLICE BEAR MUCH OF THE BURDEN

The expenditures of the Federal Government for enforcement are among the few items that can be given in an entirely authentic form. The records show the appropriations to have been over one hundred million.

The expenditures of the States and cities are difficult to estimate. Appropriations for enforcement appear on few of the State budgets. In 1924, for instance, the only ones made were: Virginia, \$70,000; Wisconsin, \$60,000; Nebraska, \$50,000; Wyoming, \$52,000; New Hampshire, \$15,200; Ohio, \$109,430; Missouri, \$8,500. Even the various organizations working for modification hesitate to make a guess regarding the expenditures by the States.

Not only in the tax losses are the farmers injured by prohibition, but they bear the great proportion of the direct damage in losses on crops. In 1919 the barley farmers produced 147,608,000 bushels at a value of \$1.20 a bushel, or at a total value of \$178,080,000. But in 1927, with the barley crop at 265,577,000 bushels, its face value was only \$180,-

127,000. No brewers on large-scale production; therefore the 1927 barley was only worth 67 cents a bushel. So the farmers lost on their 1927 crop approximately \$140,655,000 due to prohibition. This is on one crop in one year. The following table shows what the barley farmers can charge as losses to prohibition. I base these on the 1919 per bushel price:

| | | |
|-------|-------|--------------|
| 1920 | ----- | \$94,666,000 |
| 1921 | ----- | 124,156,800 |
| 1922 | ----- | 123,806,240 |
| 1923 | ----- | 128,276,060 |
| 1924 | ----- | 93,624,500 |
| 1925 | ----- | 132,695,060 |
| 1926 | ----- | 116,490,150 |
| 1927 | ----- | 140,655,810 |
| Total | ----- | 954,368,620 |

Ten million acres of land would be used for barley production should the Volstead Act be modified. The drys will answer that the brewers did not consume the total crop in any one year, but they did use over one-third of it and, paying a high premium for it, were responsible for such a high price as prevailed in 1919.

[U. S. Department of Agriculture, Miscellaneous Circular No. 23]

THE AGRICULTURAL OUTLOOK FOR 1924

(By staff of Bureau of Agricultural Economics)

1. The United States is exporting about 20,000,000 bushels of barley each year, and the price of barley is therefore affected by the world price. The recovery in European production is increasing the foreign competition.

Notwithstanding that production has been maintained, market receipts during the past five years have been less than one-half as large as formerly.

[Yearbook of Department of Agriculture, 1922]

2. Effect of prohibition: The most recent factor affecting the production of barley has been the prohibition of brewing. . . . The brewers of the United States were using slightly more than 50,000,000 bushels of barley each year at the time when brewing was prohibited. This 50,000,000 bushels, while constituting only about 30 per cent or less of the crop, did cause a premium to be paid for the highest grades of barley.

The next important beer ingredient that tells a sad story for the farmer is hops. In 1919 hops had a per pound value of 77.6 cents and in 1927 of 23.1 cents. In 1919, 24,970,000 pounds brought \$19,376,000, but in 1927, 29,794,000 pounds brought only \$6,808,000.

Rice, which was exceedingly extensively used in beer, has sustained a loss in value since prohibition. In 1919, 41,985,000 bushels of rice were worth \$111,913,000 and in 1927, 40,231,000 bushels were worth \$37,728,000, or a loss of over \$70,000,000.

When we look at rice we find a most astonishing situation in 1915, 1916, and 1917. We find that in 1915 the brewery consumption of rice was nearly 168,000,000 pounds. In 1916 somewhat over 141,000,000 pounds. In 1917 about 125,500,000 pounds. A total used during that 3-year period of over 434,000,000 pounds. An average use per annum of nearly 145,000,000 pounds, which has been lost by the drys.

Materials used in the production of fermented liquors in the United States, years ending June 30, 1915, 1916, and 1917

[Compiled by the Bureau of Crop Estimates, U. S. Department of Agriculture, from records of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Treasury Department]

| Material | Unit of quantity | July 1, 1914, to June 30, 1915 | July 1, 1915, to June 30, 1916 | July 1, 1916, to June 30, 1917 |
|----------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Malt | Bushels | 62,991,856 | 57,683,970 | 67,931,577 |
| Hops | Pounds | 38,839,294 | 37,451,610 | 41,958,753 |
| Rice | do | 167,750,177 | 141,249,292 | 125,632,269 |
| Corn or cereals | do | 604,890,901 | 650,745,703 | 666,401,619 |
| Grape sugar or maltose | do | 52,079,621 | 54,934,521 | 63,213,698 |
| Glucose or sirup | Gallons | 7,185,563 | 2,742,854 | 6,557,209 |
| Grits | Pounds | 6,619,510 | 109,371,482 | 193,263,640 |
| Other materials | Bushels | 484,641 | 72,355 | 180,436 |
| Do | Gallons | 6,630 | 19,112 | 16,656 |
| Do | Pounds | 68,880,530 | 24,756,974 | 17,573,893 |
| Total, all items estimated | do | 3,274,261,921 | 3,004,754,590 | 3,477,526,330 |

Those who prior to prohibition had raised barley where they now raise too much wheat are especial sufferers because of the Volstead Act. Hon. Sydney Anderson indicated the extent of the farmer's interest in the brewing business when he stated to the House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture on August 2, 1912, that—

There are to-day 8,000,000 acres of land in this country under cultivation in barley. The barley crop last year was 139,000,000 bushels, and the estimate this year is about 160,000,000 bushels. The production of beer in this country amounts to nearly 2,000,000,000 gallons annually, a per capita consumption of about 20 gallons. I merely mention these facts as an indication of the magnitude of the business. The brewers some years ago issued a propaganda to induce the farmers of the Northwest to engage in barley growing in order that they would have a sufficient supply of that product to manufacture beer. I feel that the farmers who have gone into barley raising—and there is practically no market for it except such as comes from its use in making beer—are entitled to have the term "beer" defined.

In an extension of remarks by Hon. Charles H. Randall in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (vol. 56, pt. 12, 65th Cong., 2d sess.) the farmer may find how much the brewers took of his product. Mr. Randall sets forth:

Mr. Speaker, there is before the House the report of disagreement between the House and Senate conference committees on the price of wheat. The House stands for \$2.20 and the Senate insists upon \$2.50 wheat.

The assurance which it is proposed to give the farmer of the price which he shall receive for his wheat, of course, has relation to the food supply of the country. Such a proposition is based upon the effort to assure a sufficient food supply by encouraging the increase of the acreage of wheat.

The food administration wants this law. Yet the food administration can by one stroke of a pen save 4,000,000 pounds of bread daily and fails to act. Last summer Mr. Herbert Hoover, in answer to an avalanche of demands to save the food wasted by brewers, wrote the following response:

"In 1916 there was used in the production of malt for the manufacture of beer for home consumption and export about 60,000,000 bushels of barley, 15,000,000 bushels of corn, and about 3,000,000 bushels of rice. It will be seen therefore that the economic advantage to be gained from the prohibition of the manufacture of beer relates almost entirely to the question of saving 60,000,000 bushels of barley, which could be milled to 60 per cent of its food value and produce a pound loaf of barley bread per day for 6,000,000 people."

Since the above letter was sent out by Mr. Hoover he has written me under date of January 22, 1918:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANDALL: In the administration of the food bill we have reduced the foodstuffs used in brewing by 30 per cent. I hope that by this order there may be effected a saving of approximately 18,000,000 bushels of grain."

It will be seen at a glance that from Mr. Hoover's own figures the brewers are still permitted to use 42,000,000 bushels of barley, more than 10,000,000 bushels of corn, and more than 2,000,000 bushels of rice annually. The barley alone will make more than 4,000,000 pounds of bread daily.

"About 8,000 square miles of American farm lands were at one time devoted to the production of barley for brewers," says E. C. Horst, an American farmer.

I have only seen one answer to my proposition, and that was an editorial in a 1928 number of the Saturday Evening Post. This publication is always intent on fairness, and the editorial I now intend to make comment on has an honest inspiration, but, nevertheless, comes to unfounded conclusions, if the logic of the situation is to have sway. It reads as follows:

PROHIBITION AND FARM DISTRESS

The perennial discussion of prohibition takes many turns, some of them devious enough. Now and then one hears a loud voice declaiming that prohibition has been a prominent cause of agricultural distress.

During the calendar year 1916 there were used in the manufacture of alcohol and of distilled spirits some 40,000,000 bushels of grains, and in the brewing of fermented alcoholic beverages some one and a half million tons of cereal preparations. During the year 1926 something like 9,000,000 bushels of grains and 100,000 tons of cereal preparations were so employed. These are official data from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the Treasury Department. The loss of market as material for alcohol and alcoholic beverages may therefore be placed at around 80,000,000 bushels at the outside.

The crop of grains in 1926 was around five and a third billion bushels. The 80,000,000 bushels that might otherwise have gone into distilleries and breweries was therefore under 2 per cent of the crop. This quantity of grain is less than the probable error in the crop estimates. It is nothing less than absurd to ascribe to the loss of this special market any substantial proportion of farm distress.

In 1917 when the question of curtailment of the use of grain in distilleries and breweries came up the users of grain for such purposes resisted curtailment on the ground that little loss of feeding stuffs occurred, since distillery and brewery residues were fed to animals. There was some truth in this contention. But it is inconsistent to make this claim and at the same time to claim that a large market is lost when grains are not so employed.

During recent years the count of horses and mules has been substantially reduced, probably by as much as 5,000,000 head. This has been due to replacement by automotive equipment. These work animals would use annually between three and four hundred million bushels of oats and corn. Compared with this the 80,000,000 bushels whose market has been lost through prohibition is of little importance. Would the people who wish distillation and brewing restored as a market for grain also wish machines banished and work animals restored as a market for grain?

There can be no doubt that the consumption of milk and fruit juices has been increased as a result of prohibition. This enlargement of market for farm produce must be set against the loss of market for grain. When alcohol dropped out of the diet something else took its place and represented new demand. We can not agree that agriculture as a whole lost a market through prohibition. The only people who lost business were distillers and brewers. For them to hide behind the skirts of distressed agriculture is too transparent a maneuver to fool anybody but the wets.

Prohibition might be well called an antigrain consumption law. My purpose now is to compare the consumption of grain before and after prohibition. Of the 5,000,000,000 bushels of grain produced, only the corn and barley production were of major importance in the prohibition debacle. Rye, from the standpoint of the crop produced and quantity ever used, was affected in a minor degree, and, of course, wheat and oats were only consequentially affected.

The 1923 wheat crop measured 900,000,000 and oats 1,200,000,000 in bushels. So these two crops contributed 2,100,000,000 to the five and one-third billion bushels cited in the editorial.

The destruction of the brewery market for corn and barley would only have an indirect effect on prices of wheat and oats but a direct and serious effect on corn and barley prices. The rye farmer, with land too poor for other grains, has conclusive evidence of harm in the loss of his domestic market.

Adam Smith, in substance, said:

A man who brings to market for sale 10 bags of wheat and finds in the market place buyers willing to purchase only 8 bags learns that it is the price of the 2 bags for which he fails to find immediate buyers that makes the price on the 10.

Applying Adam Smith's wisdom, and developing the figures involved, we can not conclude on a parallel with the editorial, though we may assume the correctness of the elementary mathematics of the editorial. Its arithmetic is sounder than its economics.

I have had the help of an expert grain-market man in making the analysis I am about to submit on prohibition, the grain market, and the conclusions of the Saturday Evening Post.

The fiscal year 1926-27 indicates a consumption for beverages of under 5,000,000 bushels of malt or barley and a little over 2,000,000 bushels of corn.

In the last three preprohibition years the use of corn by the distilling and brewing industries aggregated—

| | Bushels |
|-----------|--------------|
| 1915..... | 27, 143, 000 |
| 1916..... | 45, 643, 000 |
| 1917..... | 49, 324, 000 |

A total of a little over 122,000,000 bushels of corn, or an average consumption per year of nearly 41,000,000 bushels.

In the most recent three years for which I have complete figures available, these industries used—

| | Bushels |
|-----------|-------------|
| 1924..... | 5, 357, 000 |
| 1925..... | 7, 496, 000 |
| 1926..... | 8, 262, 000 |

A total use during these years of a little over 21,000,000 bushels, or an average use per year by these industries of about 7,000,000 bushels.

These figures establish that in the 3-year dry period the domestic demand for corn was reduced by an aggregate of 100,000,000 bushels, and that the yearly use of corn by these

beverage industries has been reduced on the average about 33,000,000 bushels.

In these same dry years the exports of corn have been as follows:

| | Bushels |
|-----------|--------------|
| 1924..... | 18, 366, 000 |
| 1925..... | 12, 762, 000 |
| 1926..... | 23, 084, 000 |

This exportable surplus of corn, which farm experts claim is the cause of the distress, would not during these last three years have existed had the corn crop enjoyed the domestic demand of a size equal to that which obtained as an average consumption for three preprohibition years. The domestic brewing and distilling demand has been reduced by prohibition 33,000,000 bushels per year. The exportable surplus in the same three years has been about half that amount. A universally condemned cause of the farm trouble, the surplus of corn, was caused itself by prohibition. The proximate cause is the surplus, but the real, though remote, cause is prohibition.

When we consider barley we find the brewing and distilling use was in—

| | Bushels |
|-----------|--------------|
| 1915..... | 65, 349, 000 |
| 1916..... | 62, 164, 000 |
| 1917..... | 85, 738, 000 |

Since prohibition we find a total of only 17,162,000 bushels, or an average annual use of about 5,700,000 bushels. We find a reduction of use annually on the average of about 65,000,000 bushels.

The domestic demand for, or market, has been destroyed by a yearly average of thirty-three and one-third million bushels of corn and sixty-five and one-third million bushels of barley, or a total disappearance of American annual demand for the two grains of about 100,000,000 bushels.

It is true that in both brewing and distilling feed by-products are recovered, which products are in high favor amongst the dairy interests.

These by-products aggregate about 20 per cent of the initial weight of the raw material, so that the net disappearance after deducting feed residue would be in substantial accord with the editorial's 80,000,000-bushel estimate.

The price registered in terminal markets, which gives the crop value, is measured by the demand there for the supply of grain which is brought there for sale. We must, therefore, compare these primary receipts, namely, the arrival of grain at the terminal markets, with the actual demand, as experienced now, and the theoretical demand which would have existed had preprohibition demand in addition been preserved.

The receipts of corn at primary markets in the last three years have ranged from 232,000,000 to 284,000,000 bushels. Those receipts approached markets and found the demand for corn has been reduced by an average of 33,000,000 bushels. The demand has been reduced by prohibition alone nearly, say, 14 per cent. The demand for barley has been reduced approximately by 65,000,000 bushels per year, or by more than the whole amount of present primary receipts.

So barley has had to find a new market. It has had to compete with corn for the feed trade, and it has done this at the injury to both the corn and barley farmer.

To apply the Adam Smith theory: The American corn farmer brought to market seven cars of corn and found there buyers for six cars, the buyer for the seventh car having been outlawed from the market by prohibition. The farmer who has raised barley has brought his barley to market and found that as the premium-paying brewer could not brew, he would not buy. He has had to sell it to a buyer who paid cheaply for it only for its feed value.

Adam Smith would be forced to declare that prohibition has had a crippling effect on the farmer. The man on the farm is paying for hypocrisy through the nose.

The arrangement of figures given, all of which are from governmental documents, contradict the inferences drawn from the editorial and indicate that the comparison of an annual loss of market demand for 80,000,000 bushels of

grain is far more serious in the results to the American producer of grain, in the way of reducing his income, than is indicated by the editorial comparison of that loss with the whole crop. If one compared it with the national debt or the annual American bank clearings, in dollars, it would appear even more insignificant than the Post's editorial indicated.

The United States Department of Agriculture Year Book for 1924 contains some interesting comparative statements of rye, corn, and barley prices prior to and during prohibition.

Rye: Seven-year average, 1914-1920, \$1.28; 1918, \$1.61; 1920, \$1.45. In 1925 the price on the farm was not much better than 50 cents.

Corn: 7-year average, 1914-1920, \$1.11; 1918, \$1.52; 1920, 62.6 cents. In 1925 the price on the farm was about that of 1920.

Barley: 7-year average, 1914-1920, 90.9 cents; 1918, 98.6 cents; 1920, 76.1 cents. In 1925 the price on the farm was about 40 cents.

The hops farmer was also badly affected by prohibition. The year prior to prohibition the farmers received about \$20,000,000 for the hops. Last year they received \$6,000,000.

Rice, which was extensively used in beer, brought in 1919 for 42,000,000 bushels \$112,000,000, while in 1929, for 45,000,000 bushels it brought in \$40,000,000. This loss to the farmer is chargeable to prohibition.

The farmers have been propagandized by the dries for many years. They were led to believe if they supported prohibition their taxes would be reduced 80 per cent, that crime would disappear, and there would be no more criminal-court costs, and that jails and eleemosynary institutions would be emptied. Just the reverse has been true. The principal interest of the farmer in the prohibition question was to get rid of the saloon in his own particular locality, something he could have done through local option, and he had no idea when he was agitating a wider degree of prohibition that he was paving the way for his own economic destruction.

A dispatch from Washington, D. C., appearing in the New York World some years ago:

The District of Columbia has increased its arrests for intoxication 168 per cent in the seven years since the Volstead Act went into effect. Arrests for manufacture of liquor advanced 307.7 per cent; for sale of liquor, 825.4 per cent; for transporting, 4,580.9 per cent; for possession, 13,323 per cent; and for driving a vehicle under the influence of liquor, 1,083 per cent. The only declines are 9.4 per cent in arrests for "drinking in public" and 83.3 per cent for possession of property designed for manufacture of liquor, according to a chart submitted by Maj. Edwin B. Hesse, District police head, to a House appropriations subcommittee and made public to-day.

The Canadian farmer must be amused at the Yankee farmer across the border as he contemplates the reports of Canadian grains in liquid form sent into the Volsteadized United States.

The Washington correspondent of the New York Times, February 6, reports that:

The minutes of the August conference, with some deletions, were made public at the State Department to-day, and revealed a large annual increase in the amount of liquor exported from Canada to the United States in violation of the United States laws. This movement was set forth from official records by William R. Vallance, Assistant Solicitor of the State Department, to the customs conference, in figures on the value of alcoholic beverages exported from Canada, which were as follows:

| Fiscal year | Total | To United States | Percentage to United States |
|-------------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1924..... | \$14,854,175 | \$8,714,709 | 62 |
| 1925..... | 16,225,533 | 11,610,169 | 72 |
| 1926..... | 21,207,777 | 17,207,777 | 82 |
| 1927 ¹ | 9,069,093 | 8,236,126 | 91 |

¹ 5 months ending Aug. 31, 1927.

Also from a Washington, D. C., dispatch in the Seattle (Wash) Star of February 7, 1928:

Vast dimensions of the illegal liquor traffic on both sides of the Canadian-American border were revealed to-day with publication of minutes of a joint customs conference here last August. Prices

of bootleg liquor on the American side of the border will be increased if legislation recommended by the conference to the Canadian Parliament is enacted. The minutes revealed that between 1924 and 1927 the percentage of liquor exported from Canada ostensibly to the United States increased from 61 to 91 per cent.

Moreover, the farm country has always proven a rich harvest for Anti-Saloon League collectors. How much they have gathered from the farm belt I do not know. Perhaps the league will be glad to tell the farmers how much the farmers have paid for prohibition propaganda, which has been to them the promulgation of an Iscarlot.

Modification of the Volstead Act will go a long way toward economic relief of the farmer, and when the figures are presented to him he will change his views, particularly when he realizes that while he has grown poor the bootlegger, the Canadian farmer, the prohibition agent, the dry lecturers, and press agents have prospered at his expense in a theoretically dry country.

The following bulletin of Hallgarten & Co. is timely on the economic aspect of prohibition:

NEW YORK CITY, November 1, 1930.

BULLETIN—THE REVIVAL OF AN OLD INDUSTRY

Constructive developments in the security market have, to a certain degree, become identified with the growth of particular industries. Public attention was attracted by earning power, investment position, and the potential outlook. We cite a few instances. Public-utility issues provided a material impetus for a recovery in values after the 1920-21 depression. This was followed by the motors, reflected especially in the rise of General Motors. Radio securities followed, and the movement culminated in a marked enthusiasm for stocks of aviation companies. If the entrance of new factors can serve to encourage investment psychology—why may not the same effect be obtained through the revival of an old industry?

We are approaching this problem entirely from its economic side. Though we consider its possible import worthy of careful consideration, we have hesitated to place our views before you in the bulletin, as the subject has been too frequently relegated to the ethical field and treated theoretically at least as a great moral issue. The economic side, however, is now asserting itself, while a large percentage of the voters also appear to feel that the moral issue is not all on the side of the eighteenth amendment.

Over six months ago we touched on the possible revival of the brewing industry when discussing the outlook with individual members of the organization, and they will be familiar with our general views. Certain personal considerations served as an inhibition against giving our views wider currency. However, now that this question is being debated in the public press, and that a possible revival of the industry has been referred to as responsible for the decline in certain stocks, accompanied by a search for brewing securities, we feel that the inhibition no longer applies. Furthermore, we are concerned entirely about the economic factors and about the constructive impetus this revival implies. The dispute as to the ethical merits of the issue we regard as not within the province of our work.

There are three major factors involved:

1. Federal revenue: The present cycle of depression is expected to materially reduce Federal revenues as determined by corporation income taxes, individual income taxes, custom revenues, etc. In 1914 the brewing industry had an output of over 66,000,000 barrels. The normal tax was equal to \$3 a barrel, which secured for the Government a revenue of \$198,000,000. In addition, a special war tax of \$3 was imposed during the war. The production had declined to 50,266,000 barrels in 1918. We believe it may be assumed that a legalization of beer will bring about a production equal to the 1918 figure, affording the Federal Government a minimum revenue of \$150,000,000, based on the \$3 tax per barrel. The population has increased materially since that date, and, may we say, the thirst has increased proportionately.

2. Construction and allied industries: This offers, we believe, a major consideration. With but few exceptions, the old breweries would have to be reconditioned and equipped. The same, we believe, applies to the big malting plants. A revival further entails the installation of machinery, particularly as pertaining to the beer-bottling business. Nobody expects the return of the saloon. The majority of the trade would therefore be in the form of bottled beer, which would call for large installations, as well as orders for bottles, boxes, caps, and trucks. This latter feature should not be overlooked, as it is an important item.

2a. Employment: We understand from sources which we believe are reliable, but can not vouch for its authenticity, that one prominent brewer was consulted by Washington authorities regarding the effect a revival of the brewing industry would have on unemployment. He is supposed to have made the statement that considering the ramifications of the business, it would give employment to 2,000,000 people once the resumption of operations had been legalized.

3. Farm relief: A statement has been credited to Mr. James Clifford Stone, vice chairman of the Federal Farm Board, that wheat prices would tend downward for the next four years, largely because of increasing Russian competition abroad. To what extent Mr. Stone may have been influenced in his statement by the general advice of the Farm Board that wheat growers reduce their acreage and raise wheat only for United States consumption, thereby realizing the protection of our tariff, can not, of course,

be established. To adopt the advice of the Federal Farm Board the farmer would be compelled to diversify his crop.

In 1914 the Federal census revealed that the cost of materials used in brewing and malting was approximately \$167,000,000. By far the larger amount of this item, we understand, was represented by barley. It is particularly this phase of the picture which deserves to be stressed, we feel. Prohibition sentiment was particularly strong in the Middle West, the farm belt. The economic depression is especially keenly felt in this very territory and industry. According to our studies, economic considerations usually outweigh all other factors.

The absorption of the barley acreage by other crops, primarily wheat and corn, has not been felt thus far because the war eliminated Russia as an exporter of wheat. We have seen figures as high as 450,000,000 bushels of Russian wheat exports quoted for the year 1913. Not only did Russian wheat exports cease but the adjustment to new revolutionary conditions, aggravated by a large crop failure, compelled Russia to import wheat. Nineteen hundred and thirty appears to be the first year that Russian wheat production has attained a level which permits of export. The estimates vary from a minimum of 48,000,000 bushels to as high as 150,000,000. The advice of the Federal Farm Board suggesting diversification as a solution and production more commensurate with our domestic demand appears very timely. A recognition of this fact by voters in the farm belt may have an important bearing on the revival of the brewing industry.

This recalls to our mind another instance where the pressure of economic considerations forced a modification in a territory which was fundamentally as dry in sentiment as the farm belt. We refer to the Province of Ontario. It remained dry while many of the other Provinces had abolished or modified prohibition so as to permit the revival of the brewing industry. For years Ontario witnessed the parade of American tourists hastening across its territory into Quebec. This latter Province was enjoying the fruits of its policy in the form of a large increase not only in the actual revenue derived from the brewing industry and the profits of the liquor commission, but also in American tourist trade as such.

The writer had occasion to travel extensively in the Province of Quebec shortly after the present Quebec liquor law was inaugurated. He had been asked to report on the impression Quebec conditions made on him—whether the policy was workable, and what beneficial or detrimental effects it gave rise to. He discussed the law, among others, with a former member of the liquor commission, and was particularly interested in learning how the revenues were applied. He was told that one-third was applied to reduction of the debt, one-third to building of roads in order to attract more tourists, and one-third for schools.

The gentleman added: "When I was on the commission I suggested that the revenue be divided into four parts." He had a twinkle in his eye, so the writer took the bait and asked how he intended to apply the fourth part. Whereupon the gentleman replied most unconcernedly, "I was going to suggest that it be contributed to the prohibition movement in the United States."

To harbor strong dry sentiments was one thing. To see other Provinces, particularly Quebec, benefit from their change in policy and the business revival it apparently brought in its wake seems to have placed the subject in a very different light, with the result that Ontario followed the procession. We do not believe it was the weakening of dry sentiment but the pressure of economic circumstances.

Wheat acreage in the United States increased from 47,589,000 in 1913 to 61,141,000 in 1929. Canadian acreage jumped from a 5-year pre-war average of 9,945,000 to 24,168,000 in 1929. In Argentina and Australia the combined acreage expanded from 23,654,000 in 1913 to 33,978,000 in 1929. Allowing for the improvement in agricultural methods, a better idea of the threat is gained which a re-entrance of Russia into the wheat market presents to the farmer and the economic compulsion he may face to scan all possible openings affording a profitable diversification of his crops.

Thus far prohibition has been treated largely as a political issue, and though we are adverse to considering the political aspects of the situation, in this case we believe the two factors are so closely interwoven at this stage as to call for comment. There can be no expectations, we feel, for a sudden election of a predominantly wet Congress or even a Congress which would favor a modification of the Volstead Act permitting the brewing of 2.75 per cent beer. The most optimistic hopes of the wets are limited to a gain of approximately 6 to 7 votes in the Senate and 60 to 70 votes in the House. This would not constitute the majority needed to pass the necessary enabling legislation.

But this does not complete the picture. Aside from the economic pressure in the farm belt which may make itself felt, there are two other elements: (1) The attitude of the American Federation of Labor, which at its convention in Boston passed a resolution requesting the legalization of a 2.75 per cent beer; (2) The Hoover commission on law enforcement, headed by Mr. Wickersham. The members of this commission were selected from among the leading personalities in the field of law. We refer to Mr. Wickersham himself, Dean Pound, of the Harvard Law School, the outstanding authority on "common law" in our country, Judge Kenyon, and others.

It is generally believed that the subject of prohibition has afforded the principal study of this commission, and reports have been current that its deliberations may result in a recommendation of a modification of the prohibition law. Should such a recommendation be made, it would lift the entire question out-

side of the mere controversy of wet and dry sentiment and place it on the basis of a cardinal principle constituting the very foundation of a democratic government—the proper observation of the law of the land. On this principle all parties can unite, and the President may assume leadership without injecting his own personality into the field of wet and dry contentions. In other words, it may be possible to visualize a recommendation by the President to Congress in accord with advice given the President by his own commission, supported solely by consideration of proper enforcement and observation of the law of the land, to modify the Volstead Act so as to materially reduce or entirely eliminate a disregard for law and its sinister corollary, the development and growth of the bootleg industry.

And what has this to do with the trend of securities in general and the bond business in particular? We return to our introductory comments. Would not a revival of an old industry afford a similar impetus to recovery as a development of a new branch in our industrial life? If our premises are correct, the legislation of beer would stimulate general business activity and find reflection in increased confidence. It was for this reason that we thought a discussion of the situation timely as having a possible bearing on the fundamental trend and therefore constituting a proper subject for the bulletin.

The question has been raised whether such modification of the Volstead Act permitting 2.75 per cent beer would be subject to attack as unconstitutional, and therefore be brought up before the Supreme Court for determination. As we understand the law, Congress is empowered to pass such enabling act as it may decide upon in order to enforce the amendment. It seems a moot question whether the Supreme Court would inject itself into the actual determination of what is or is not intoxicating. However, we do not claim sufficient acquaintance with constitutional law to answer this particular question, and whether actual repeal of the Volstead Act may be necessary to bring about a revival of the industry through the elimination of the enforcement agency.

This, to my mind, is a very well-reasoned statement as to the economic phases of prohibition. What the country needs is a revival of industry. A revival of the brewing industry would accord with majority opinion, as shown in official and unofficial referenda. It would also mean a revival of congressional prestige.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SPARKS].

Mr. SPARKS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. On the 29th day of September, 1930, Hon. Hays B. White, a former Member of this House was summoned from among the living to join that innumerable throng beyond the realms of earthly existence and into a haven of eternal peace.

He was born at Fairfield, Iowa, on September 21, 1855, and died at his home in Mankato, Kans.

He was of sturdy Scotch-Irish stock.

His father died when he was but 13 years of age.

He was then left as the main dependence of his widowed mother. Although untrained in business, he set about his task with a resolute determination to succeed. He conquered the developing business problems, and the impoverished condition of his father's estate was transformed into a successful business.

His close application to the task assumed, his clear and keen intellect enabled him to clear the obstructions that line the pathway of life, and travel successfully on to the end, achieving merited rewards for his fidelity and perseverance.

He was cut down by the reaper of Death while upon the threshold of a brilliant political success. He was honored with the positions of mayor, State senator, a member of the Kansas State Tax Commission, and Congressman from the sixth district of Kansas for 10 years, the longest continuous service of that character ever enjoyed by anyone in that district.

With confidence and youthful ambitions he penetrated the mysterious veil of life with each unfolding day, and with the passing of each successive day he left an indelible imprint of rich accomplishments upon the record of his life.

He was a son of the Great Plains, enduring the hardships and privations incident to pioneer life; but the struggles of that period enriched him for the great responsibilities he later assumed when placed by his fellow men in positions of trust.

In official life he exhibited that same true devotion to the trust reposed in him that had characterized his accomplishments in private life.

The brilliancy of his political achievements did not detract from his loyal and affectionate devotion to his family, for in the circle of his home the richest and noblest of man's attributes found expression, for his fidelity to home and family brightened the record of this life with its greatest luster.

The shadows of eternal night have encompassed his earthly form, but his real substantial qualities of honesty, integrity, kindness, modesty, gentleness, and generosity will be perpetuated in the hearts of those who knew him until they, too, shall reach the sunset of life's journey. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Swick].

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, in the last session of Congress I introduced a resolution calling for a general survey of hospital facilities in the United States. Due to the press of other legislation that bill was not considered.

During the recess I have studied to some extent the hospital situation in the United States. A week or two ago I noticed in the Washington Post this significant statement made by Dr. C. Rufus Rorem, in which he says:

Hospitals have become one of the Nation's major industries, with investments totaling in the neighborhood of \$3,125,123,000. Dr. C. Rufus Rorem, economist on the staff of the committee on the costs of medical care, reported here to-day.

"This represents more than all money invested in the lumber, paper, or printing industries," Doctor Rorem said. There are 7,310 hospitals in the United States and their annual cost of operation is \$900,000,000, nearly one-third of the Federal Government's total yearly expenditures, he reported.

I feel that in view of the magnitude of this hospital service it was right and proper that it should be called to the attention of the House and to the Nation. For that reason I have requested this time to call the committee's attention to it and in this way inform the country of the great activities that are being carried on for the benefit of the needy veterans and those requiring hospitalization.

There is little doubt, that Congress will in the very near future enact legislation to make hospitalization and treatment available for every needy war veteran. A great majority of veterans, and posts of veteran organizations are under the impression that this was done when we amended the World War veterans' act and made it possible to hospitalize nonservice-connected cases when Government facilities were available.

Beginning with the act of March 3, 1919, Congress has to date appropriated for the construction of veterans' hospitals \$92,450,000, which when completed will have a total bed capacity of 31,000, and these added to the facilities made available in other Government agencies will in the next few years make available for beneficiaries of the Veterans' Bureau approximately 40,000 hospital beds. This will provide ample hospital facilities for service-connected cases.

During the year ended June 30, 1930, the average number of service-connected cases requiring hospitalization was approximately 17,000. There were available beds for 31,525. Due to the increasing number of nonservice-connected cases being hospitalized, every bed was filled, and there were waiting lists in every regional office. In other words, 45 per cent of the veterans receiving hospitalization were nonservice-connected cases.

It is very evident, if the Government is going to make it mandatory to hospitalize every veteran regardless of the source of his disabilities, and continues the policy of erecting new hospitals to meet the requirements of such a mandate, we are facing a construction program far surpassing our total efforts to date.

There has been insistent demand on the part of State departments of the various veterans' organizations for the construction of sufficient hospital facilities within the confines of their respective States to meet the needs of the veterans resident therein, despite the policy of the Veterans' Bureau to ignore State lines in this matter. It is interesting

to note, however, that with the completion of the present program, the Veterans' Bureau will be operating 64 hospitals. There will be but nine States without a veterans' hospital, and six of these will have hospital facilities operated by the bureau, or the Federal Government.

I learned yesterday that 31 States out of 48 have appeared before the veterans' subcommittee on hospitalization this year and requested greater hospital facilities in their States.

Since the year 1925, one year after the passage of legislation authorizing hospitalization of nonservice-connected cases, this class of veterans has steadily increased at the approximate rate of 2,000 annually. In 1925 they represented 14.43 per cent of the total load; in 1926, 20.12 per cent; in 1927, 29.27 per cent; in 1928, 37.18 per cent; in 1929, 43.01 per cent; and in 1930, 46.49 per cent.

The growing problem of hospitalization and necessity for a steady expansion of hospital facilities may be readily understood by studying the increasing number of hospital admissions each year. Since 1919 there have been 832,687 admissions to hospitals. During the fiscal year of 1930 there were 92,115 admissions, the largest number since the peak in 1922, an increase of 10 per cent over the admissions in 1929. Of the total, 46 per cent were admitted to bureau hospitals, 50 per cent to other Government institutions, and 4 per cent to civil and State hospitals.

Since June 7, 1924, 52 per cent of all admissions have been for veterans whose disease or injury is not service connected, and of the total admissions in 1930, 71 per cent were of this class.

I want you to think of this particular problem. Seventy-one per cent of all of the admissions last year were nonservice-connected cases. If this Government is going to adopt the policy of hospitalizing nonservice-connected cases, then we must evaluate our resources and in that way come to a definite conclusion as to our future building program.

The cost of erecting hospitals may be estimated on the basis of \$3,750 per bed capacity. The cost of operating them is estimated by the bureau as an average of \$3.86 per diem for all classes. The cost of operating tubercular hospitals per diem last year was \$3.28; of neuropsychiatric hospitals, \$2.81; and of general medical and surgery hospitals, \$4.49.

In other words, every time you open a bed there begins immediately an expense of \$3 per day. The only difference between a bed occupied and a bed vacant is a matter of a little food and medicine. It has been determined that this amounts to very little, probably not over 80 cents a day. So, taking the hospital bed at \$3.80, it costs \$3 a day to maintain the bed empty.

It is reasonable to believe that the number of veterans requiring hospital treatment will increase each year as they grow older and become more susceptible to the ravages of disease, with the resultant loss of vitality which comes with age. Certainly it behooves us to take stock of our resources now, with a view to conservation and economic expenditure of funds in the payment of our debt to the veterans before it is necessary to reverse our policies and deny veterans the right of hospitalization, except in case of service-connected disabilities.

The Veterans' Bureau several years ago adopted the policy of hospitalizing veterans in Government owned and operated institutions, and Congress has endeavored to appropriate funds to carry out a building program to accomplish that end. If the same conditions and requirements existed to-day that were in force at the time that policy was adopted, no further expenditure would be necessary for hospital construction. However, with the right of hospitalization given to every veteran, regardless of service connection, the demand for new construction will continue for at least 15 years, presenting a financial picture almost inconceivable if not impossible to fulfill.

I favor the proposal to hospitalize every needy veteran, regardless of service connection and despite the fact that it has a close relation to State medicine. Like every other

Member of this House, I am eager to repay in every possible way the debt of gratitude we owe those who have borne the brunt of battle in defense of their country in time of greatest need.

On the other hand, I recognize our obligation to the taxpayers of the Nation, who are faced each year with an increasing taxation. It is our duty to conserve the resources of the Nation by utilizing all resources to the fullest extent.

We have to-day within the confines of the United States and her territorial possessions approximately 8,000 hospitals, with a bed capacity of approximately 1,000,000. This represents a capital investment of nearly \$3,500,000,000. Of this number in 1930 there were 6,665 hospitals qualified for registration with the American Medical Association, with a bed capacity of 907,133. The average number of patients in these hospitals during the year 1930 was 726,766, or 65.5 per cent of their capacity. An approved hospital is required to maintain constant personnel and facilities to care for 85 per cent of its total capacity. Therefore the hospitals of the country could have cared for approximately 230,000 additional patients without increasing their personnel or facilities.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWICK. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Is it the gentleman's idea that every war veteran, whether his disability is service connected or not, should be hospitalized at Government expense?

Mr. SWICK. No.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. The gentleman's idea is only those who are really dependent?

Mr. SWICK. That is true.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Is it not true that very few men are hospitalized in veterans' hospitals who have the money to take care of themselves at home?

Mr. SWICK. I can not say as to that.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. I know in my own district I tried to make some sort of a survey of that, and I found that there were very, very few who could be hospitalized and stand the expense themselves, who had the money to take care of them, who went to veterans' hospitals.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWICK. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. What would the gentleman do with a case of this kind? Say a man went to the trenches of France and was gassed. He came back and naturally he wanted to get home quickly; he was not carefully examined. Nothing appears in his record showing any disability, but within the last year he has become afflicted with tuberculosis. Physicians tell me that they can not say when tuberculosis is the result of being gassed. Would not the gentleman be fair enough with that kind of a soldier to send him to a hospital to be taken care of at Government expense?

Mr. SWICK. I think there never has been any question, never so far as I have been able to determine, about such hospitalization. Just last week I had two cases who had to be hospitalized, and there was no question asked relative to their ability to pay their way or whether their cases were even service connected.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I misunderstood the gentleman. The gentleman is, then, in favor of granting them hospitalization regardless of whether their disability is of service connection or not?

Mr. SWICK. Yes. That is now in the provisions of the veterans' act.

Mr. BLANTON. I am in favor of granting all of them hospitalization, wherever needed, if they served in our Army.

Mr. SWICK. It has been determined that unless a hospital is filled to 85 per cent capacity it must operate at a loss. We find these hospitals all over the United States operated to only 65.5 per cent of their capacity.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The gentleman is now referring to hospitals not connected with the Veterans' Bureau?

Mr. SWICK. Yes; I am referring to all the hospital facilities in the United States.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. And the gentleman's statement in regard to the necessity of operating 85 per cent capacity refers to independent hospitals?

Mr. SWICK. Yes, indeed. So we find that this percentage between 65.5 and 85 is entirely lost. All of those beds in between there, 19½ per cent, are vacant every day in our great civilian hospitals. There may be some argument as to whether these civilian hospitals compare favorably with the veterans' hospitals so far as their equipment is concerned.

It seems to me that if the great general hospitals over the country are fit to take care of the 117,000,000 people who were not in the war, they surely are equipped well enough to take care of the 4,500,000 who were in the war.

The question of traveling expenses enters into this problem. Last year the Veterans' Bureau expended more than two-thirds of a million dollars, paid for transportation of the veteran from his home to some veterans' hospital and return.

It has been estimated that 91 per cent of the hospital capital has been provided by public contribution, without expectation of repayment or return on the investment. Operating costs of these hospitals in a very great amount is borne by the public through municipal, county, and State taxes, membership in various organizations, religious and fraternal, by endowments and contributions through community chests and other charitable organizations. Few if any of them could operate if required to depend on the fees received from patients.

The logical conclusion, after studying the hospital situation of the United States, is that there is an oversupply of general hospitals, all of which in a large way are dependent upon the generosity of the great American public for support.

There may be those who feel that the veteran should be hospitalized in a Government hospital. Many of the veterans felt, soon after coming out of the Army, that they wanted to be hospitalized by themselves. But conditions have changed. It has been 12 years since the close of the war. Eighty per cent of these men at that time were single and rather preferred to be with their comrades. To-day, however, the picture has changed, and 80 per cent of these men are married and have families, and it seems to me that a great majority of them would prefer to be hospitalized in their own city, or in their own county, or even in their own congressional district, where "Johnnie" or "Mary" could call on them, along with mother, every day or two and know exactly how the veteran father and husband was getting along, and it would be a comfort for him to have these near and dear ones see him often.

I want to conclude by asking that each and every one of you may give this subject your earnest consideration, with a view to giving the greatest service to the veteran with the least burden on the taxpayer.

I have selected four States in the Union and have given some consideration to the general type of hospitals in those States. For instance, in Boston I have taken four hospitals that are outstanding as shown by the record of March last year, The Hospital Service of the United States. Those four hospitals have a combined bed capacity of 1,431. After taking out the 85 per cent, which they should have to make them pay expenses so that they would not operate entirely at a loss, we still have 476 beds available. That is just in the city of Boston. Those beds are available all the time for the use of veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Swick] has expired.

Mr. SWICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting two tables from the Veterans' Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

United States veterans' hospitals as of December 1, 1930

| Location | Capacity ¹ | Facilities under construction | Average beds occupied during November | Remarks |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| 24. Palo Alto, Calif. | 1,010 | ----- | 910 | |
| 27. Alexandria, La. | 421 | ----- | 367 | |
| 32. Washington, D.C. | 205 | 65 | 146 | Contract for new construction awarded Nov. 6, 1930. Contract date of completion July 29, 1931. |
| 37. Waukesha, Wis. | 250 | ----- | 218 | |
| 42. Perry Point, Md. | 1,015 | ----- | 1,013 | |
| 48. Atlanta, Ga. | 200 | ----- | 186 | |
| 49. Philadelphia, Pa. | 416 | ----- | 354 | Loaned by Navy Department. Quarters for nurses and other personnel leased. |
| 50. Whipple, Ariz. | 600 | ----- | 522 | Loaned by War Department. |
| 51. Tucson, Ariz. | 261 | ----- | 257 | |
| 52. Boise, Idaho. | 235 | ----- | 183 | Do. |
| 53. Dwight, Ill. | 225 | ----- | 189 | |
| 55. Fort Bayard, N. Mex. | 450 | ----- | 392 | |
| 57. Knoxville, Iowa. | 705 | ----- | 703 | |
| 60. Oteen, N. C. | 612 | ----- | 579 | |
| 62. Augusta, Ga. | 617 | 138 | 618 | Contract for new acute building awarded Nov. 15, 1930. |
| 63. Lake City, Fla. | 302 | ----- | 278 | |
| 67. Kansas City, Mo. ² | 200 | ----- | 176 | |
| 72. Fort Harrison, Mont. | 306 | ----- | 232 | Loaned by War Department. |
| 74. Gulfport, Miss. | 425 | 138 | 436 | Contract for additional facilities awarded Dec. 1, 1930. |
| Edw. Hines, Jr., Hines, Ill. | 1,007 | 648 | 944 | Personnel quarters completed. Remodeling main building, being accomplished under several contracts. All completed Jan. 1, 1931. |
| 77. Portland, Oreg. | 313 | ----- | 269 | |
| 78. North Little Rock, Ark. | 750 | ----- | 753 | |
| 79. Outwood, Ky. | 375 | ----- | 362 | |
| 80. Fort Lyon, Colo. | 500 | 138 | 353 | New neuropsychiatric building completed Nov. 21, 1930. |
| 81. Bronx, N. Y. | 950 | ----- | 980 | Nurses' quarters leased. |
| 85. Walla Walla, Wash. | 355 | ----- | 255 | |
| 86. Sheridan, Wyo. | 438 | ----- | 449 | |
| 88. Memphis, Tenn. | 360 | ----- | 313 | |
| 89. Rutland Heights, Mass. | 420 | ----- | 389 | |
| 90. Muskogee, Okla. | 400 | ----- | 358 | |
| 91. Tuskegee, Ala. | 747 | ----- | 583 | |
| 92. Jefferson Barracks, Mo. (St. Louis). | 403 | ----- | 362 | |
| 93. Legion, Tex. | 433 | ----- | 370 | |
| 94. American Lake, Wash. | 512 | ----- | 500 | |
| 95. Northampton, Mass. | 555 | ----- | 550 | |
| 96. Sunmount, N. Y. | 375 | ----- | 357 | |
| 97. Chillicothe, Ohio. | 614 | ----- | 631 | |
| 98. Castle Point, N. Y. | 400 | ----- | 397 | |
| 99. Excelsior Springs, Mo. | ----- | 301 | ----- | Capacity being increased from 125 to 301 beds. Contract date of completion, Jan. 1, 1931. 99 per cent completed. |
| 100. Camp Custer, Mich. | 602 | 138 | 602 | Contract date of completion of new acute building, Sept. 2, 1931. 3 per cent completed. |
| 101. St. Cloud, Minn. | 494 | ----- | 520 | |
| 102. Livermore, Calif. | 318 | ----- | 269 | |
| 103. Aspinwall, Pa. | 226 | 38 | 232 | Contract date of completion of facilities, Jan. 5, 1931. 97 per cent completed. |
| 104. San Fernando, Calif. | 230 | ----- | 227 | |
| 105. North Chicago, Ill. | 971 | 164 | 782 | Contract date of completion of new facilities, May 20, 1931. 38 per cent completed. |
| 106. Minneapolis, Minn. | 562 | ----- | 584 | |
| 107. Bedford, Mass. | 492 | 152 | 496 | Contract date of completion of new facilities, Jan. 8, 1931. 92 per cent completed. |
| 108. Northport, Long Island, N. Y. | 944 | 448 | 923 | Contract date of completion of new facilities, Sept. 15, 1931. 49 per cent completed. |
| 109. Fargo, N. Dak. | 57 | ----- | 52 | |
| 110. Somerset Hills, N. J. | 430 | 465 | 50 | Opened for patients Nov. 12, 1930. Contract date of completion of additional facilities, Aug. 26, 1931. 14 per cent completed. |
| 111. Coatesville, Pa. | 483 | ----- | 49 | Opened for patients Nov. 11, 1930. |
| 112. Lincoln, Nebr. | ----- | 197 | ----- | Construction completed Nov. 26, 1930. |

¹ Approved by construction division.

² Leased; all other properties Government owned.

United States veterans' hospitals as of December 1, 1930—Contd.

| Location | Capacity | Facilities under construction | Average beds occupied during November | Remarks |
|----------------------|----------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| 113. Hartford, Conn. | ----- | 232 | ----- | Contract date of completion, Jan. 21, 1931. 94 per cent completed. |
| 114. Lexington, Ky. | ----- | 249 | ----- | Contract date of completion, Feb. 28, 1931. 93 per cent completed. |
| Total | 24,171 | 3,511 | 21,719 | |

Table showing number of registered hospitals, with total bed capacity and average number of patients, in each State, as shown by latest census reports

| State | Number of hospitals | Number of beds | Number of patients |
|----------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Alabama | 98 | 9,691 | 7,207 |
| Arizona | 81 | 4,595 | 3,074 |
| Arkansas | 69 | 7,411 | 5,573 |
| California | 421 | 51,865 | 41,261 |
| Colorado | 110 | 12,161 | 9,131 |
| Connecticut | 90 | 14,817 | 12,364 |
| Delaware | 15 | 1,665 | 1,190 |
| District of Columbia | 37 | 10,367 | 8,150 |
| Florida | 82 | 8,159 | 5,903 |
| Georgia | 113 | 12,332 | 9,613 |
| Idaho | 59 | 2,990 | 2,010 |
| Illinois | 353 | 63,774 | 51,354 |
| Indiana | 149 | 21,531 | 16,485 |
| Iowa | 176 | 17,892 | 14,025 |
| Kansas | 137 | 11,870 | 9,317 |
| Kentucky | 118 | 12,539 | 9,741 |
| Louisiana | 66 | 11,395 | 8,730 |
| Maine | 67 | 6,198 | 4,962 |
| Maryland | 85 | 14,549 | 11,932 |
| Massachusetts | 292 | 49,820 | 42,239 |
| Michigan | 227 | 34,229 | 27,649 |
| Minnesota | 230 | 25,039 | 20,270 |
| Mississippi | 74 | 7,611 | 5,770 |
| Missouri | 157 | 25,289 | 20,574 |
| Montana | 66 | 4,658 | 3,337 |
| Nebraska | 104 | 9,296 | 7,209 |
| Nevada | 22 | 955 | 604 |
| New Hampshire | 50 | 4,668 | 3,558 |
| New Jersey | 168 | 31,714 | 25,233 |
| New Mexico | 49 | 3,546 | 2,331 |
| New York | 607 | 131,214 | 112,724 |
| North Carolina | 173 | 14,449 | 10,708 |
| North Dakota | 53 | 4,914 | 3,711 |
| Ohio | 277 | 44,857 | 37,332 |
| Oklahoma | 116 | 10,798 | 8,102 |
| Oregon | 92 | 9,010 | 7,169 |
| Pennsylvania | 399 | 71,687 | 57,556 |
| Rhode Island | 31 | 6,210 | 5,069 |
| South Carolina | 67 | 6,244 | 4,681 |
| South Dakota | 64 | 5,106 | 3,727 |
| Tennessee | 111 | 12,684 | 9,722 |
| Texas | 281 | 25,772 | 19,143 |
| Utah | 36 | 2,598 | 1,847 |
| Vermont | 34 | 3,029 | 2,525 |
| Virginia | 113 | 15,720 | 12,774 |
| Washington | 117 | 14,362 | 10,753 |
| West Virginia | 78 | 8,441 | 6,205 |
| Wisconsin | 219 | 25,233 | 20,687 |
| Wyoming | 32 | 2,179 | 1,508 |
| Alaska | 25 | 585 | 229 |
| Canal Zone | 9 | 1,740 | 1,167 |
| Guam | 1 | 90 | 92 |
| Hawaii | 49 | 4,676 | 3,050 |
| Philippine Islands | 92 | 8,074 | 5,326 |
| Porto Rico | 65 | 2,758 | 890 |
| Virgin Islands | 2 | 128 | 64 |

Table showing number of veterans undergoing treatment on June 30, 1930, in all hospitals by patients' State of residence, with the number hospitalized outside of home State

| State | Total number | Outside |
|----------------------|--------------|---------|
| Alabama | 612 | 466 |
| Arizona | 345 | 57 |
| Arkansas | 497 | 216 |
| California | 2,046 | 162 |
| Colorado | 408 | 147 |
| Connecticut | 399 | 393 |
| Delaware | 44 | 44 |
| District of Columbia | 475 | 91 |
| Florida | 448 | 264 |
| Georgia | 705 | 478 |
| Idaho | 201 | 68 |
| Illinois | 2,365 | 406 |
| Indiana | 654 | 414 |
| Iowa | 378 | 168 |
| Kansas | 261 | 249 |

Table showing number of veterans undergoing treatment on June 30, 1930, etc.—Continued

| State | Total number | Outside |
|---------------------|--------------|---------|
| Kentucky..... | 454 | 341 |
| Louisiana..... | 552 | 254 |
| Maine..... | 141 | 97 |
| Maryland..... | 407 | 205 |
| Massachusetts..... | 1,263 | 134 |
| Michigan..... | 895 | 349 |
| Minnesota..... | 948 | 111 |
| Mississippi..... | 304 | 201 |
| Missouri..... | 1,002 | 610 |
| Montana..... | 255 | 100 |
| Nebraska..... | 186 | 186 |
| Nevada..... | 63 | 61 |
| New Hampshire..... | 138 | 104 |
| New Jersey..... | 723 | 705 |
| New Mexico..... | 173 | 96 |
| New York..... | 3,014 | 323 |
| North Carolina..... | 511 | 378 |
| North Dakota..... | 153 | 112 |
| Ohio..... | 926 | 449 |
| Oklahoma..... | 507 | 239 |
| Oregon..... | 362 | 140 |
| Pennsylvania..... | 1,931 | 975 |
| Rhode Island..... | 185 | 136 |
| South Carolina..... | 324 | 324 |
| South Dakota..... | 156 | 129 |
| Tennessee..... | 510 | 341 |
| Texas..... | 1,137 | 653 |
| Utah..... | 74 | 73 |
| Vermont..... | 60 | 58 |
| Virginia..... | 647 | 277 |
| Washington..... | 615 | 106 |
| West Virginia..... | 296 | 296 |
| Wisconsin..... | 605 | 132 |
| Wyoming..... | 111 | 64 |

United States troops in the World War, by States

[Figures, which are official, cover the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps]

| State | Total commissioned and enlisted | Per cent of total |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| Alabama..... | 84,109 | 1.78 |
| Alaska..... | 2,096 | .05 |
| Arizona..... | 12,470 | .27 |
| Arkansas..... | 70,314 | 1.49 |
| California..... | 161,367 | 3.42 |
| Canal Zone..... | 337 | .007 |
| Colorado..... | 42,898 | 1.00 |
| Connecticut..... | 67,709 | 1.44 |
| Delaware..... | 9,191 | .20 |
| District of Columbia..... | 27,318 | .61 |
| Florida..... | 42,217 | .90 |
| Georgia..... | 103,288 | 2.19 |
| Guam..... | 248 | .005 |
| Hawaii..... | 9,535 | .21 |
| Idaho..... | 22,071 | .47 |
| Illinois..... | 322,731 | 6.84 |
| Indiana..... | 133,121 | 2.82 |
| Iowa..... | 113,719 | 2.41 |
| Kansas..... | 81,265 | 1.72 |
| Kentucky..... | 93,944 | 1.99 |
| Louisiana..... | 76,581 | 1.61 |
| Maine..... | 33,032 | .69 |
| Maryland..... | 62,034 | 1.32 |
| Massachusetts..... | 198,692 | 4.22 |
| Michigan..... | 164,075 | 3.48 |
| Minnesota..... | 118,410 | 2.55 |
| Mississippi..... | 62,345 | 1.32 |
| Missouri..... | 161,805 | 3.43 |
| Montana..... | 39,663 | .84 |
| Nebraska..... | 57,094 | 1.21 |
| Nevada..... | 5,412 | .12 |
| New Hampshire..... | 18,918 | .41 |
| New Jersey..... | 144,156 | 2.84 |
| New Mexico..... | 14,304 | .31 |
| New York..... | 489,608 | 10.16 |
| North Carolina..... | 86,550 | 1.83 |
| North Dakota..... | 27,333 | .58 |
| Ohio..... | 239,609 | 5.08 |
| Oklahoma..... | 90,378 | 1.92 |
| Oregon..... | 43,138 | .92 |
| Pennsylvania..... | 359,817 | 7.63 |
| Philippine Islands..... | 26,265 | .56 |
| Porto Rico..... | 18,073 | .39 |
| Rhode Island..... | 27,809 | .59 |
| Samoa..... | 90 | .002 |
| South Carolina..... | 63,109 | 1.34 |
| South Dakota..... | 32,038 | .68 |
| Tennessee..... | 89,618 | 1.90 |
| Texas..... | 191,656 | 4.05 |
| Utah..... | 21,275 | .45 |
| Vermont..... | 13,910 | .30 |
| Virginia..... | 91,623 | 1.94 |
| Virgin Islands..... | 59 | .001 |
| Washington..... | 66,541 | 1.41 |
| West Virginia..... | 57,856 | 1.23 |
| Wisconsin..... | 120,483 | 2.55 |
| Wyoming..... | 12,258 | .26 |
| No residence..... | 2,422 | .055 |
| Total..... | 4,727,988 | 100.00 |

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. SHREVE. I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SWICK] two additional minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWICK. I yield.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Is it the gentleman's idea that the Veterans' Bureau should designate certain hospitals which are now private hospitals, to be used for veterans?

Mr. SWICK. Exactly. Not private hospitals. I do not think the gentleman wants to make that statement. General independent hospitals; civilian hospitals.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Then the gentleman's idea is that there should be some fixed charge to be paid for those veterans?

Mr. SWICK. Absolutely.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. That is my idea entirely. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BURTNES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWICK. I yield.

Mr. BURTNES. Is it the gentleman's intention to make the hospitals that are selected for the exclusive use of the veterans?

Mr. SWICK. Oh, no; no.

Mr. BURTNES. Simply to put the veterans in there to the extent they have facilities for them?

Mr. SWICK. I might say I have a plan worked out in my own mind, but I do not have time in this discussion to take that up. I believe it could be worked out whereby every veteran could be hospitalized in his own district.

Mr. BURTNES. In existing institutions?

Mr. SWICK. In existing institutions.

Mr. BURTNES. Would that require the appointment of Veterans' Bureau doctors who would reside in the place where the hospital was located?

Mr. SWICK. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SHREVE. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this place in the RECORD a statement on the recent corn-sugar ruling made by Secretary Hyde, and to include therein a copy of the ruling and statement issued by the Secretary in explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill before us under the Department of Commerce carries an appropriation for research and experimental work by the Bureau of Standards, looking to the discovery and development of new industries. One of these new industries that the bureau has under way is levulose sugar made from the common plant known as the Jerusalem artichoke. I think it is four years ago that I had the honor of appearing before the subcommittee which has charge of this bill to ask for the initial appropriation for this new sugar. I again want to thank the chairman of this committee, Mr. SHREVE, and his associate, Mr. ACKERMAN, for the interest that they then took in this matter, an interest that has not been abated. The development that has been carried on with these appropriations has been highly successful. I am assured that the new sugar is well under way to commercial production.

Whatever immediate uses we may be able to make of this product, we are assured that conditions of sugar shortage, such as we incurred during the World War and following it, when the price of sugar was pushed up to nearly 30 cents a pound, will never recur. If ever such a world contingency arises again we will be able amply to supply ourselves with sugars derived from American products and made by American labor.

In this connection it may not be amiss to call attention to the recent order issued by the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, Hon. Arthur M. Hyde, in the matter

of so-called corn sugar, which is the elder of the two sugars in the development of which the Bureau of Standards has been concerned. The order has not only freed corn sugar from the ban under which it has existed but it assures a free market for the artichoke sugar also. The order sets out the status of corn sugar under the Federal food and drugs act and is as follows:

Corn sugar (dextrose) when sold in packages, must be labeled as such; when sold in bulk must be declared as such; but the use of pure refined corn sugar as an ingredient in the packing, preparation, or processing of any article of food in which sugar is a recognized element need not be declared upon the label of any such product.

Nothing in this ruling shall be construed to permit the adulteration or imitation of any natural product such as honey by the addition of any sugar or other ingredient whatever.

ARTHUR M. HYDE,
Secretary of Agriculture.

DECEMBER 26, 1930.

In explanation of this order I will insert the statement made by the Secretary himself regarding this new ruling, as follows:

This ruling removes a discrimination against the use of corn sugar which has too long been permitted. The requirement heretofore that the presence of corn sugar as an ingredient in prepared foods be declared on the label was not a matter of law, but was a matter of administrative interpretation of the law. This ruling therefore involves no change in the Federal food and drugs act; nor does it change the rules with reference to labeling of harmful or injurious ingredients. Labeling of such ingredients still is required.

When the Federal food and drugs act was passed 23 years ago corn sugar was a muddy, brown product less than 50 per cent sweet. Under conditions existing then a prejudice existed against it. As a matter of administrative procedure, this department ruled that its presence in a prepared food must be declared on the label.

In the last 10 years great progress has been made in refining corn sugar. It is now a clear, clean, white, granulated sugar. It is a wholesome and healthful food. It is now about 75 per cent as sweet as cane sugar. It has some properties more valuable than cane sugar. It has no qualities which are in anywise harmful to health. The reason for the old departmental ruling has disappeared. It is high time that the discrimination against it, based on an ancient prejudice, should disappear also.

At the beginning of the administration of the Federal food and drugs act this department made the same ruling as to edible vegetable oils, other than olive oil, that has existed against corn sugar. Our regulations for many years required that the presence of any vegetable oil except olive oil in salad dressings must be declared on the label. But modern methods of refining made wholesome edible oils from cottonseed, peanuts, and corn. The regulation requiring a declaration of their presence on the label was removed in 1923. The public was not injured—the administration of the law was not weakened. Quite the contrary. The case of edible vegetable oils is not distinguishable in principle from the case of corn sugar. It is desirable that departmental regulations should keep pace with industrial developments. They should not retard progress.

If the use of corn sugar in prepared food products without labeling would serve in any wise to weaken either the Federal food and drugs act itself or the administration of the law, the damage has long since been done. For many years corn sugar has been used in confectionery, candy, ice cream, bakery products, and prepared meats without its presence being declared on the label. The public has eaten these products and found them appetizing and healthful. The law has been in no wise weakened or undermined. No reason whatever exists for such discrimination. To deny to corn sugar the advantage of the market its merits warrant would be to perpetuate the prejudices of 25 years ago, and to deny any progress in the processing and refining of wholesome foods.

I can not agree to the proposition that the purchaser of prepared fruits or other foods in which sugar is an element expects or believes that such sugar will always and everywhere mean sucrose. The purchaser of canned peaches, for instance, expects to buy, primarily, canned peaches. There is no declaration on the label that they are sweetened at all, the label declares only peaches. He looks to the manufacturer to guarantee that they will be tasty and appetizing. He expects the Federal food and drugs act to insure their wholesomeness. If those requisites are fulfilled, he is far from being deceived. He is entirely satisfied.

Nor is there any danger whatever to the manufacturer of special brands whose formulas call for sucrose and whose brands are a guarantee of quality. This ruling can not affect them. If, on the other hand, its use is beneficial and wholesome without adversely affecting the appearance or taste of the product, the fact that corn sugar is cheaper ought to commend it to the consuming public, who are entitled, as a matter of right, to demand food products on the most economical basis.

There is also an affirmative economic reason for this change in departmental rulings. American agriculture is overproduced. The fact that production runs ahead of consumption is responsible for most of the ills of agriculture. The Federal Farm Board, farm organizations, many of the State colleges, and this department are striving to reestablish the economic balance of agriculture.

The control and limitation of acreage planted is one method of reestablishing that balance. Finding new uses and new outlets for crops is another method.

We produce annually about 2,700,000,000 bushels of corn. Only about 275,000,000 bushels of this ever reaches primary markets. The sale price of this small amount fixes the farm price for the whole crop.

There exists a potential market for corn through corn sugar variously estimated at from 5,000,000 to 100,000,000 bushels per annum. The smaller figure represents about 2 per cent of the cash corn reaching primary markets. The larger figure represents about 35 per cent. It is not likely that the larger figure will be realized for many years. Be the percent large or small, the opening of this potential market for additional corn is a step in the right direction. If we fail to use all available methods of restoring agricultural balance, whether those methods represent great and spectacular gains, or merely short and unnoticed steps, we shall be derelict in duty.

I believe that this modification removes an undeserved stigma from corn sugar; that it harms or deceives no one; that it weakens neither the Federal food and drugs act nor its administration; that it is a just recognition of modern progress in refining; and that it will aid in some degree in reestablishing the economic balance of agricultural products.

This order is the culmination of a persistent and consistent campaign of education carried on through Congress. Corn sugar, in its present form, a pure, refined, and crystallized white sugar, 99.9 per cent dextrose, came into existence as recently as 1922. It encountered a handicap, which has now been removed, which was not of legislative origin but which was, as the Secretary says, "a matter of administrative interpretation of the law." In removing this discrimination the Federal food and drugs act has not been disturbed. The interpretation referred to arose from a definition which was promulgated before that Federal act was placed on the statute books. At that time sugar was defined as sucrose. That was a logical definition at the time, for the only sugars known in commerce then were cane and beet and maple, all of which are sucrose sugars. When corn sugar knocked for admission it could not qualify under that definition for it is dextrose and not sucrose. It was with respect to this chemical name alone that corn sugar was discriminated against. The discrimination had nothing to do with the merit of the sugar but only with its chemical name.

No legislative action was ever necessary to remove this discrimination, for it was by no act of Congress that the discrimination existed. Legislative action was sought after consultation with the late Henry C. Wallace, who was then Secretary of Agriculture, who at that time did not feel free to act to remove the discrimination. Corn sugar was not only a new product at that time but it was a product that labored under many prejudices which had been left over from the time when an imperfect glucose and what Secretary Hyde calls "a muddy, brown product less than 50 per cent sweet" were placed on the market. Secretary Wallace, in effect, told the late Senator Albert B. Cummins and myself that it was our duty to establish a reputation for the new sugar and to create a public sentiment that would support a removal of the discrimination.

In view of what has been accomplished it is with some pride that I look back on my own connection with this legislative campaign of education which has enabled the present Secretary of Agriculture to issue his order. It was in 1924 when the first of the McNary-Haugen bills was under discussion that I presented this issue on the floor of the House, and I think that was the first presentation or even mention of this corn sugar in Congress.

When I was called upon to speak on the McNary-Haugen bill I wandered from the subject and asked if it might not be possible to make better use of our so-called surplus products than to try to dump them in that euphonious place called "abroad" at such prices as they might be willing to pay in that place, the losses being made up by fees levied on the products sold in our domestic markets. I cited the fact that we were at that time converting ordinary corn into a refined sugar in the plant of the Penick & Ford Co., in my home city, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. This suggestion called out many inquiries on the floor and at the conclusion of my remarks my colleague from Wisconsin, HENRY A. COOPER, asked me to make a fuller statement of this new

industry, which I did under permission to extend my remarks.

My statement aroused so much interest that I was encouraged to introduce a bill in the form of an amendment to the food and drugs act, to remove the handicap, Mr. Cummins introducing the same bill in the Senate. The bill, I want to add, was prepared by Mr. E. C. Corey, of Des Moines, Iowa, then attorney for the National Corn Growers Association. Our purpose was to make it part of the program of farm legislation. It was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. When it came up for hearings, the late Dr. H. W. Wiley appeared against it. He was opposed to all amendments to the act which he had been instrumental in placing on the statute books. He treated this new sugar as an adulterant in his testimony and he even went so far as to question its dietetic values.

This changed the whole course of our procedure. It took us into the realms of chemistry and dietetics. Not being either a dietician or a chemist, I asked for help, and Mr. W. B. Newkirk was assigned to be my technical assistant. Mr. Newkirk is an eminent chemist. He was then in the employ of the Corn Products Co., but he had been in the employ of the Bureau of Standards when this sugar was developed, or perfected, there.

The bill was referred to a subcommittee of which my colleague, T. J. B. ROBINSON, was chairman. He was, of course, friendly to the legislation and he did much to help clarify the situation which had been created by Doctor Wiley's opposition. The report of this subcommittee is one of the important documents in the campaign of education. They received a report from George K. Burgess, Director of the Bureau of Standards which, among other things, set forth the testimony of a dozen or more leading physicians and dietitians to whom he had submitted the question of the effect of dextrose and levulose sugars if used in the average daily diet. The authorities consulted were all of the highest standing, such as Dr. John Harvey Kellogg, of the Battle Creek Sanatorium; Dr. Russell M. Wilder, speaking for the Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn.; the director of the Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore; Prof. Lafayette B. Mendel, of Yale University and director of the Russell Sage Institute of Pathology; and many others of like repute in the professional world.

Without an exception all these men testified in favor of these new sugars. Not one of them cited a harmful effect that would come from their use and many of them cited beneficial effects. Some of the men even spoke of them as sugars "par excellence."

In the report of this subcommittee the testimony of Dr. ROYAL S. COPELAND, a Senator from the State of New York, was set forth to this effect:

One reason why unripe fruit is irritative and indigestible is because the contained sugar has not yet been converted into digestible sugar. The more we take of digested and converted sugar the better for us. On this account the ideal sweetening product is dextrose. * * *

I would be the last man to attempt to weaken these health-giving and life-saving laws, but as experience dictates, they should be revised to meet modern conditions. Personally, I was so impressed with the wholesomeness and utility of corn sugar that when I approved the ice-cream standard for New York City I insisted that it should be so written as to permit the use of corn sugar. That is the law to-day.

Thus supported, the bill was reported out by the full committee and was passed by a majority of 44 in the House, but it was talked to death in the Senate. When it came to a vote in that body, after the vote had been taken, viva voce, in the affirmative, which was overwhelming, a Senator from West Virginia got the floor and prevented the vote from being completed. Taking advantage of the fact that at 2 o'clock another bill would come up, he talked until it was too late to call for the negative votes. This Senator afterwards told Mr. Cummins that he himself had no objections to the bill, but he had promised a ladies' aid society in his State that he would oppose the legislation. Those ladies up in the mountains had been influenced solely by a magazine article. I mention this incident to show that

a group in some remote place may determine the course of legislation in Washington.

Not discouraged, similar bills were introduced in each subsequent Congress. Senator CAPPER, of Kansas, taking charge of them in the Senate after the retirement of Mr. Cummins. The campaign of education was kept going relentlessly and corn sugar found its way into the public mind.

In the meantime, also, the food administration under the Department of Agriculture had admitted the use of dextrose without labeling into many food products, such as candies and confections, ice cream, all bakery products, and many meat products. Every such admission weakened the opposition. If it could be used in these products, why not in others or in all?

The way was prepared for the final action, which stands to the credit of the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Hyde.

In issuing his order, the Secretary stipulated that the ruling—

Shall not be construed to permit the adulteration or imitation of any natural product such as honey by the addition of any sugar or other ingredient.

This proviso was not necessary, for honey is in full protection under the rules and regulations of the Food Administration. It was added to allay the fears of the bee and honey men, many of whom had been led to believe that this new sugar would in some manner be detrimental to their industry. There was never any ground for such beliefs or fears. The proponents of corn sugar are the friends of the bees. Without bees, we understand, the clovers could not be propagated, the bees being the carriers of the pollens, and without the clovers for rotation crops the Corn Belt soils would soon be exhausted.

What future is before these new sugars—dextrose and levulose—and they may be spoken of jointly, for they are supplemental to each other. In all the processes of nature these two sugars are associated. They are the sugars that we find in all the ripened fruits. By the alchemy of the sunshine which ripens the fruits, the raw and the crude sugar in the form of sucrose that flows in the juice of the trees and vines and bushes is converted into these two elemental sugars. It is dextrose and levulose that we take into our systems when we eat perfected fruits, and not sucrose, and that is one reason why ripened fruits are so wholesome and so healthful.

Even the bees which gather sweets in the form of sucrose when they deposit them in their hives by a God-given process of their own convert the sucrose sugar into dextrose and levulose which is the fit food for the young. The best honey is more than one-third dextrose and more than two-fifths levulose while sucrose exists only as a trace. It is the dextrose and levulose in honey that makes it such a wholesome food.

What the chemists do in the factories is in imitation of what the bees do in their hives and what nature does in ripening its luscious fruits.

And the same process is provided for in the human system. When sucrose sugar is taken into it, by the action of the acids, or whatever they are, the sucrose is converted into dextrose and levulose and it is only in such forms that the sugar can be assimilated into the human organism. Dextrose is blood sugar in fact.

I cite these facts to show how vital and beneficial these new sugars are and how unreasonable the opposition to them has been.

And as to their future, that is to be worked out. Corn sugar has been given the right of way. That is all. It is no longer under any ban. It must now proceed on that right of way upon its merits. I look for no astounding revolution in the sugar world. Cane and beet sugar are well entrenched. They have uses for which neither dextrose nor levulose can be substituted. Because of their chemical qualities these new sugars must be used after their own formulas. It may be possible, eventually, to substitute corn sugar

for cane and beet sugars in 25 per cent of the industries. Of course this percentage may be increased by new developments. But admitted to that extent, it would call for the conversion of more than a hundred million bushels of corn into sugar. If even half of this estimate is realized it will mean much to agriculture and to American labor.

There are chemists and industrialists who believe that these two new sugars will dominate the sugar world. There are vast possibilities in them. I will not venture into prophecy.

In conclusion, as one of the proponents of this movement and in behalf of the corn-producing States, of which Iowa is chief, I want to thank Secretary Hyde for his far-visioned and statesmanlike action. I believe he has done something that will stand out in his record and that will bless his country and its laborers whether in the corn fields or in the corn-products factories.

And may not the greatest blessing of all fall on those who are the consumers of sugar, and without sugar no human being can exist—it is par excellence the food that supplies human energy and life itself.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL].

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD my statement to Secretary Hyde with reference to the corn-sugar ruling, made about one week ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HULL]?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM E. HULL, SPOKESMAN FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION THAT CALLED UPON THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE IN BEHALF OF CORN SUGAR, DECEMBER 18, 1930

We are here this morning to ask that the proper provision be made for recognition of the pure refined sugar, made from American corn and known as dextrose, or corn sugar, in the definitions and standards for carbonated beverages, and for canned fruits and vegetables, which are in the making and will come before you shortly for your decision. The new definitions and standards for canned fruits and vegetables are especially important, because under recent legislation these standards will have the force of law.

We have been unable to understand why it is that some of the definitions which have been drawn up as a guide in the administration of the pure food law permit the use of corn sugar on the same basis as cane or beet sugar without label declaration, while others discriminate against corn sugar by recognizing only sucrose as a sweetening ingredient. We are told that these definitions look back to a definition of sugar promulgated more than 25 years ago, at a time when the only sugars available for use as an ingredient of manufactured foods were cane and beet sugar.

Since sugar was so defined, there has been developed, originating with the Bureau of Standards, the pure refined sugar, dextrose, equal in nutritive value and just as wholesome as cane or beet sugar, although it is less sweet. Its use and value as an ingredient in ice cream, candy, bakery products, and meat-food products is recognized by the department, and permitted without label declaration the same as cane or beet sugar. On the other hand, the tentative definitions issued by the department, both for beverages and for canned goods, revert back to the old definition of sugar, and makes no provision at all for corn sugar, with the result that, if they become effective, beverages, and canned peaches, canned pears, and canned peas become substandard if any corn sugar is used, and must be so labeled. Dextrose belongs to the family of sugars. Now that it is available for use as an ingredient of manufactured foods, why should not definitions now being made recognize it?

Realizing that the chief hope for relieving the distressing condition confronting agriculture in the Corn Belt lies along the lines of broadening the market for products of corn, we ask that the restrictions upon the use of corn sugar, based upon an obsolete definition of sugar, be removed from the definitions now pending before you.

The manufacturers of ice cream, confectionery, bakery products, and meat-food products use corn sugar because its use enables them to make better products. Is it not reasonable to assume that the manufacture of beverages, and the canners of fruits and vegetables, may also make better products if its use is sanctioned by your new definitions?

The pure food law was never intended to operate as a bar against the manufacture and sale of better food products, and certainly it is the function of the Department of Agriculture to recognize changed conditions and provide for the utilization of new and wholesome articles of food. These new definitions should be so drawn as to encourage manufacturers to use corn sugar, and not to place an obstacle in the way of its increased consumption. It is estimated it will utilize 35,000,000 bushels of corn per year.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] is one of the most interesting personalities in this House, and, in my humble opinion, he is one of the most valuable Members of this House.

He is absolutely fearless; he has good judgment on most things; he is a born fighter, and he is not afraid to stand alone when it is necessary in advocating his principles.

I have watched him ever since he came to the House. He was one of the first to leave for the front after war was declared. His leave was unostentatious. He served valiantly during the war. He has led many fights on this floor in behalf of the common people of the country. Time and effort consumed in those fights, even though they lose for the time being, is not time wasted or effort lost.

I remember that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] years ago was one of the first to take the floor and lead then a losing fight for the time being, in trying to save Muscle Shoals for the people of the United States. If you will look at the record of that first fight, when there was an attempt to turn Muscle Shoals over to Henry Ford under the most unreasonable contract that a shrewd, skilled lawyer could draw, as against the interests of the Government, in which, for a nominal sum the Government of the United States was to undertake to run and keep up the Muscle Shoals plant at the people's expense for 100 years, for the operation of private interests, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] led the fight against it. Only about four of us stood with him. I was one of those who stood with him, and followed him on it, and helped him to make the fight. It was then a losing fight temporarily. We got only a sprinkling of votes here and there against that proposition. It passed the House by an overwhelmingly majority, but it was never finally passed by both houses, and failed to become a law.

Years have passed and Muscle Shoals is still the property of the people of this Government. No private interest has yet taken it from the people of the United States.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] has led many losing fights, the great majority of which have been just. Most everything he fights for is diametrically opposed in this House by the so-called triumvirate, of whom, he today, and our friend from Georgia, the parliamentarian of the House [Mr. CRISP], yesterday spoke so eloquently. He is continually and constantly diametrically opposed by this triumvirate. They oppose all of his plans and policies. He is absolutely hog-tied here under the present rules of the House. Only such legislation as the triumvirate approves can be taken up and considered by the 435 Members of this House.

He naturally rebels. He does not like to be chained hand and foot to the wall; but he can not perform. He spoke eloquently of the fact that his certificate of election reads just like the certificate of election of the gentleman from Ohio who presides over this body; just like that of the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Rules Committee; and just like that of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], the leader of the House; and that he is presumed to have the same prerogatives and privileges and the same standing in the House as any other Member, and yet his hands are tied and his feet are shackled by the rules.

I have seen the time, and so have you, when the Rules Committee, by an overwhelming unanimous vote, voted a rule for certain legislation—not one rule, but several rules for different legislation—which the great majority of this body wanted passed, and you saw the then chairman of that Rules Committee [Mr. CAMPBELL] stick those rules in his hip pocket, and though besieged by the Members of the House daily and by the members of his own committee, under the direction of the then Speaker, and with the approval of the then Speaker, that chairman, the despot of the House, the Mussolini of the House, kept those rules in his hip pocket and did not bring them up and let the session of Congress die, and he refused to bring them on the floor and present them for consideration. The gentleman from New York rebels against that procedure.

He spoke this afternoon of a discharge rule. There is now no discharge rule. There is only a pretense of one. Why, you must first have 218 men sign a petition even to get a bill on the discharge calendar, then it is put on the discharge calendar to take its turn. First, the committee has 15 days in which to report; then after it is on the discharge calendar seven days you can call it up only on the Monday that is specified in the rule, and there are not many of them during a session; then you must get a second of 218, not a majority of the Members on the floor but 218 Members to stand up here and pass through tellers to second a motion to take it up. Such a rule is a farce and a sham.

We have just now a four-department bill under consideration and under debate by this body, a supply bill furnishing annual supplies for four departments of this Government—the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Labor. The time was when the committee brought separate bills in here for each of these four departments, but now you have four of them considered together in one bill, and with a 4-department bill here under debate we have about 40 Members or 50 Members of this House here on the floor. Yet the discharge rule requires that even to consider the motion to discharge 218 Members of this House must pass through tellers, and after it is put on the calendar and taken up and considered, then 218 Members must actually vote for it to pass it—not a majority of those present but 218. Yesterday I called the attention of my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] to the fact that you might have 220 Members present on the floor and 217 might vote to take the bill up, and three men might vote against it, say the triumvirate, the Speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee, and the majority leader; those three men only could vote against it, with 220 present, and 217 voting to take it up and yet you could not take it up with a vote of 217 for and 3 against it, because you must have 218 Members voting to take it up. Is not such a rule ridiculous?

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman said we were now discussing this appropriation bill and that there were only 40 or 50 Members in the House. As a matter of fact, we are in general debate, where Members may discuss any subject, and the gentleman himself is not discussing the bill or anything connected with the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I can not yield further.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] knows that the only bill now before this committee is the 4-department supply bill. We are now in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider this bill.

Mr. MICHENER. We are not considering the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. But we are in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider this bill H. R. 16110, and under the rules of the House we have a right to speak out of order, even without getting consent. I am speaking for the good of the order. I am speaking on the state of the Union, because it is the state of the Union when 435 Representatives of the Government, like a bunch of mocking birds, like slaves, if you please, with their hands tied and their feet shackled, permit a triumvirate here to control everything, and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], who does not like that system, gets up here and rebels against it. Yet the press says that the triumvirate is going to appease him; the triumvirate is going to hand him a little sop; they are going to liberalize this rule a little bit in order to appease his wrath, and then he is going to go on with the triumvirate and keep going on with them. And what are you going to get out of it? Are you going to get such rules as will permit you to perform here as the Representative of your district. No, sir. You are going to get merely a little sop. Now, if you want to be a real Representative of your district in New York, if you want to let your colleagues be real Representatives, Republicans and Democrats; if you want to do that, do not let them appease you and make you follow on with a little sop, my friend, but stand up

and make them give you something that is worth while for the people of the United States before you go along with them. Make them liberalize their rules so that Representatives in this House, at least 100 of them, may vote to take up a piece of legislation and have it considered by the House.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. If we change the rules so as to permit 100 to bring out legislation and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] brings out his legislation to repeal the Volstead law, will the gentleman from Texas stick to him and vote with him?

Mr. BLANTON. I will always vote for the right of consideration, but I would oppose his measure on its merit. The gentleman from New York has the right to have proposed legislation considered by the House. He has the right to attempt to repeal that law if he desires to do so, and, on consideration, I have the right to oppose his measure and help to defeat it.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. I want to know whether the gentleman from Texas is going to stick to him on that proposition?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I will not. I will not stick to him on such a proposition to repeal the prohibition laws. However, because a man is wrong on the merits of his bill that does not mean that he has no right to have it considered and voted on by the House. The gentleman from New York would have the right to attempt to have such a proposition considered and have a vote on it; and the gentleman from New York could not get over 100 votes in the next House for any proposition of that kind, but he has the inherent right to have the membership vote on it, and we will meet him on the merits of that proposition when the time comes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL] that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] has other ideas besides prohibition.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly he has; and I want to say again that he is one of the most valuable Members of this House in spite of the fact that he is a wet.

I spoke last night in Baltimore and I called attention to the fact that we drys are not fighting a bunch of bootleggers on this wet proposition. We are fighting some of the most intelligent and enlightened men in this Nation, lots of whom do not drink themselves. Why, you take the wet leader of the House, Mr. J. CHARLES LINTHICUM, he is as dry as I am in practice.

I spoke in a Methodist church in Baltimore last night, speaking largely to Methodists. Why, J. CHARLES LINTHICUM was raised in the old Holly Run Methodist Church, of Maryland. His father, William Linthicum, was one of the organizers of the Methodist Protestant Church of Maryland. His uncle, Asa Shinn Linthicum, who was named after Asa Shinn, who is said to have been the first president of the Methodist Protestant Church, left \$2,000 in his will to be spent either for charitable or religious purposes, and our colleague, J. CHARLES LINTHICUM, the wet leader of this House, was his executor, and he saw fit to spend that \$2,000 as an initial construction contribution to the Linthicum Heights Methodist Church, one of the largest churches in that conference, and it was J. CHARLES LINTHICUM, our wet leader, who helped devise ways and means to pay off the mortgage on the parsonage over there, and it was Mrs. Linthicum, if he will pardon my reference, who contributed the bell in the tower that calls the people to service in that church. He is a wet, but he is dry in practice, as dry as I am. I do not know of an enemy he has in Congress. He is one of the most-beloved men we have here. It is this kind of men that the drys must stand up and fight. It is this kind of men who are organized here for the wets, including a former distiller from Illinois, who does not drink himself. This is the type of men we have got to fight, and we have to meet them with logic, we have to meet them with facts, we have to meet them with personality if we expect to keep the

eighteenth amendment in the Constitution, and I want to say that it is going to stay there for the next 100 years.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I regret that I can not yield now, because I want to use my time to discuss my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK], who made his usual wet speech this evening.

What do the legislatures of the various States stand for? Ought they not to be presumed to represent the will of the people? I want to call your attention to some very interesting facts. I copied this from Senate Document No. 169, Sixty-sixth Congress, second session, embracing a communication from the President of the United States transmitting the official certification made by the Secretary of State on the ratification of the eighteenth amendment by the various States.

The Legislature of the State of New York was presumed to represent the sentiment of the people of New York. The Legislature of the State of Maryland was presumed to represent the sentiment of the people of Maryland. Why, the old commonwealth of Virginia that boasts its F. F. V's, upon whose sideboards it is said there was always a filled decanter and a glass waiting for you, it was the first State to ratify?

The eighteenth amendment was not an incident of the war, as has been stated in the wet press. The war was merely an incident of the great fight that the sober men and women of America had been making for 50 years in this Nation for a sober Government. The war helped to bring it about, but it was a mere incident of and in that long fight, and here is the way the States fell all over each other in their ratification. Why, they almost ran races with each other in their efforts to ratify first.

After Virginia came the commonwealth of Kentucky, which had been fed up on antiprohibition by all the big distilleries that were in the State. It was the second State that ratified the eighteenth amendment. Then North Dakota, South Carolina, Montana. Texas was the sixth State, ratifying on March 4, 1918. And Maryland was the seventh State, it ratifying on March 12, 1918. Then South Dakota, Delaware, Massachusetts, Arizona, Georgia, Louisiana, Michigan, West Virginia, Maine, Mississippi, Florida, Oklahoma, Washington, New Hampshire, Indiana, California, Colorado, Alabama, Oregon, Ohio, Illinois, Idaho, Kansas, and Tennessee came in line. On January 16, 1919, North Carolina, Utah, and Nebraska ratified the eighteenth amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. And on January 17, 1919, Minnesota, Wyoming, Wisconsin (the home State of our colleague [Mr. SCHAFER]), and Missouri ratified, making 38 States to ratify by January 17, 1919. Two more than the required three-fourths had ratified the eighteenth amendment on January 17, 1919. Then the States did not stop. We already had a sufficient number and more, yet Iowa, Nevada, Vermont, and even the great metropolitan State of New York ratified on January 29, 1919.

Mr. BLACK. I was there.

Mr. BLANTON. Was the gentleman a member of the legislature?

Mr. BLACK. Does the gentleman want to hear about it?

Mr. BLANTON. Was the gentleman a member of the legislature?

Mr. BLACK. I was a member of the State senate.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the gentleman vote for it?

Mr. BLACK. I voted against it.

Mr. BLANTON. And they outvoted him, just like the gentleman from New York has been outvoted here on the floor of this House ever since he has raised this wet question. He is still rebelling against the people of New York and he is rebelling against his own legislature, in the senate of which on this question he was outvoted.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman kindly yield to me?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. The senate passed it by a majority of one vote and two wet members on the Republican side were forced into a dry caucus in order to retain their committee chairmanships in the State senate.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the first good thing I ever heard about a Republican in New York. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman hear me further?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry I can not yield further. I only have five minutes.

Then Pennsylvania followed. Pennsylvania was the last one, embraced in this presidential certification, and that made 44 States, out of the 48, and it ratified the eighteenth amendment on February 26, 1919.

So we thus had 44 States out of the 48 to ratify by February 26, 1919, as certified by the Secretary up to this time, when the President certified it to the Senate. I have not mentioned the other two States that afterwards ratified, because they are not certified by the Secretary of State in the Senate document from which I have quoted. I have only mentioned the States which were certified in the message to Congress by the President of the United States.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes; the State Legislature of Missouri ratified the amendment despite the fact that, by a majority of over 200,000, the people of the State indicated that they were opposed to prohibition.

Mr. BLANTON. I still maintain that a legislature is presumed to express the will of the people. I still come back to my logic that the Legislature of Missouri, like the Legislatures of New York and Massachusetts and Maryland, is presumed to carry out the wishes and the sentiment of its people. The Constitution of the United States says it may be ratified by the legislatures of the States, and the very resolution that was passed by this Congress submitting it to the States provided that means of ratification. And it will require the same orderly procedure to repeal it.

Mr. BLACK. And the Republican Party in New York is totally wet.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I will tell you what the gentleman from New York will do when in the Democratic caucus he makes his wet motion, he will not get any further than his wet motions do in the House.

I want to now serve notice on the gentleman, as from one member of the Democratic Party, that the people of my district do not stand for that kind of sentiment.

Mr. BLACK. Do you mean the Hoover Democrats? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. No; the regular, rock-ribbed Democrats. I stayed with my party and voted the ticket, as obnoxious as the head of it was to me, because the Democratic Party is bigger than any one man and the Democratic ticket is bigger than any one man whose name happens to be on it. I supported my ticket, and the people of my district who supported that ticket do not stand for this wet sentiment as preached by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM]. God forbid that either the Republican Party or the Democratic Party will ever stand for a wet platform.

I would rather go down in defeat, and if I were a Republican I would rather they lose control of this House and of the White House, than to sacrifice principles. There is no compromise on this question; it is either that the open saloon or the eighteenth amendment shall stay in the Constitution. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC].

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, Secretaries of the Navy may come and go, yet it is doubtful if any other citizen of the United States will ever travel through as many cycles as did the Hon. Josephus Daniels when serving in this capacity.

As a rule the nimble hand of hospitality soon enmeshes every person selected for this responsibility and then certain officers in charge of bureaus are able to run riot in everything they undertake.

It is not necessary for me to point out the weak vacillating administration of some of those who, while serving in this capacity, completely lost the power of saying "no," and went out of office with a record anything but complimentary. It was not so with the Hon. Josephus Daniels. He had a backbone, he had national and world vision, and instead of acting as a rubber stamp for a clique his actions were in the interest of the Navy and the people. The record made by this splendid official during the World War will stand out for all times to come as one of efficiency and splendid judgment.

As an echo of the last campaign when Oklahoma turned over a 180,000 majority given to the Hon. Herbert Hoover two years ago and elected a former democratic Member of Congress to the office of governor, the Hon. William H. Murray, by a majority of 93,000—I am reproducing an article which was printed in one of Oklahoma's prominent newspapers as follows:

[From Daily Oklahoman, October 19, 1930]

INSIDE STORY OF WAR-TIME SCANDALS MAY BE TOLD BY DANIELS ON TRIP TO STATE

By J. V. McCLINTIC, member of the U. S. Naval Committee

Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy during Woodrow Wilson's administration, has locked up in his memory much interesting information relative to the affairs of the Nation and the world that has never been given out to the public.

He is coming to Oklahoma to speak under the auspices of the Democratic State Committee and it is the hope of his many friends that he will complete the story about the upheaval which is purported to have taken place relative to certain high-ranking officials, and in addition, inside information that has never been given the public concerning the Nation's oil reserves.

It is generally understood that when Josephus Daniels, a southerner from North Carolina, received his appointment as Secretary of the Navy the ruling officers in charge of the various functions of the Navy saw danger ahead and began quietly to spread the propaganda which brought about an avalanche of criticism on him from many sources. In fact, one publication in magazine form caused to be dedicated an entire issue to Josephus Daniels, every page being in the form of criticism, which was probably the most severe arraignment ever read by the public concerning a Cabinet officer.

It will be remembered that when Secretary Daniels went into office he immediately saw that every activity of the Navy was under the entire control of certain high ranking officers, who were determined to carry their own policies into effect. It was said that when Daniels saw this situation he immediately started the process of decapitation, removing from high positions of command many of those who had banded themselves together for the purpose of controlling every activity of the Navy, regardless of the Secretary's wishes, and these same officers, when assigned to other duties, through the activities of their friends, were responsible for the kind of back fire in the way of criticism that he had to combat for many months prior to the declaration of war with Germany.

All during this period Secretary Daniels remained silent, refusing even to dignify the attitude assumed by his critics, keeping in mind that all the American people desired was a Navy efficiently commanded, so to be ready to protect the shores of this Nation if an emergency arose.

It was under Secretary Daniels's administration that a far-sighted policy of construction was commenced, one which was well under way prior to the time we ended the war with Germany. It will be remembered that after the war had been brought to a conclusion it would only have been a few months until the United States, under his direction, would have had the most powerful fleet of any nation in the world. During the terrible struggle against Germany and her allies it was necessary to transport more than 2,000,000 men across the seas, and it was to the credit of his farseeing policies that all of these men were transported to Europe and back without there being a single major catastrophe. In addition, those he selected for responsible positions made a record that will stand for all time to come as one of the most efficient in the history of the Nation.

Diverting from the war, Secretary Daniels, when he went into office, immediately caused to be set aside certain oil reserves in the United States, having in mind that fuel oil would be used in all kinds of machinery in the future, and that sooner or later it would be necessary to change all the boilers in our ships so that oil could supplant coal. Soon after these reserves had been set aside and it was known that they contained large quantities of oil, the designing politicians began to lay plans for the purpose of obtaining control of the same, and when applications were made to him requesting permission to develop such reserves, he and his officers charged with this responsibility stood adamant, having in mind that these reserves belonged to our citizens and it was far better

to keep the oil in the ground rather than have it placed on the market.

Then came the election in 1920 and Warren G. Harding was elected President of the United States. Soon thereafter Senator Albert B. Fall was made a member of his Cabinet, being appointed Secretary of the Interior and Denby was named as Secretary of the Navy, with young Theodore Roosevelt as his assistant. Immediately the politicians who had been rebuffed and turned down by Secretary Daniels began to lay their plans for the purpose of obtaining possession of the Teapot oil dome and the California oil reserves.

The three naval officials serving under Secretary Daniels, in charge of the reserves, were immediately transferred. One was sent to the Philippines, one to Hawaii, and one to Panama, and in their place was selected an admiral by the name of Robison, who agreed to the policy and the program laid out by Fall, Denby, and Roosevelt, namely, that the oil reserves should be leased and that the storehouses of fuel belonging to the Navy should be disposed of. Secretly and silently and in as cautious a manner as possible, Secretary Fall had the jurisdiction of these reserves transferred to the Interior Department and then, without any publicity, they were disposed of without giving the public a chance to bid.

Secretary Daniels, more than any other person in the United States, knows the inside story concerning the activities of those who are responsible for probably the greatest scandal that was ever unfolded to our citizens. In addition, he can, if desirable, tell you of the German propaganda that was spread from one end of this country to the other and the methods used by our Government in solving secret code messages that came through the air, around through South America, and up the coast to those who were trying to undermine sentiment in this Nation. Very few of our citizens have any conception of the amount of damage done by the German U boats along the coast of the United States and in our harbors. These submarines sank 51 ships, carrying to a watery grave hundreds of sailors, without any information being given to the public at the time. Soon afterward the German submarines reached their peak, causing 1,000,000 tons of shipping to be lost in a month, and Secretary Daniels, more than any other one person, realized that unless something was done to check this menace American shipping would be tied up, thereby having the effect of making it impossible to move from the shores of the United States our surplus crops and manufactured articles. It was then that he called upon American ingenuity to unfold something to combat this menace, and under his direction the depth bomb and a type of fast eagle boats were put in operation, which soon spread terror to submarines, causing them gradually to be withdrawn from the sea.

No person in the Nation is capable of now revealing such a wonderful chapter as Secretary Daniels, and when he speaks at Oklahoma City, Okmulgee, Tulsa, Muskogee, and McAlester, it is hoped that our State will be the first in the Union to receive that knowledge which has been locked up in his memory for so long.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, we have had a great deal of interesting discussion here this afternoon; but I want to bring to the attention of the House and the country some further things which I am sure in a way you are already acquainted with, as they have been brought to the attention of the House from time to time. I have an article here from the Montgomery Advertiser, printed in the capital of my home State, which says:

Scores of persons are starving in Autauga County for the want of bread and meat. This fact became known yesterday upon receipt by the Advertiser of an urgent appeal in behalf of the sufferers from E. H. Pearson, well-known merchant of Autauga-ville.

These are people who have worked always to live and who will work now "at any price" if work can be found for them. They think no longer of clothes and are clamoring for food.

Mr. Pearson makes no appeal for money. What is needed is food, any kind of food, and it is needed now. His letter speaks eloquently:

"EDITOR THE ADVERTISER:

"This is the first time that I have asked to make an appeal through your paper. I will appreciate very much if you will publish this article for me, as you will see that I am only trying to help the people that are really suffering from hunger in our community. I am not asking for clothes, although they will be acceptable. I am asking for food for the people here who are actually starving.

"I have over 30 families on my place. I am not asking for help for these folks, for I have already made arrangements to take care of them. I am asking for help for the people who haven't a thing in their houses to eat and no work to do.

"There are some people in our community going around to the different homes asking if they haven't some work they can give them to do so they can get some food—they have quit thinking about clothes—for their children to eat. These are the people I am asking help for. They are willing to work for any price. There are plenty of people in our community who are not averaging but one meal a day, and they are as hungry when they get up from that meal as they were when they sat down to it.

"Day before yesterday I set aside \$20 to give to the ones who needed help most. I run a store, and looked into each case that asked me for help. If I thought they were just a little worse off than the other fellow, I gave them an order to trade \$1 in meal, meat, or lard. No sugar or coffee or things of that kind were given them. The word went out what I was doing, and that poor little \$20 melted like water and didn't start going round. I now have a bunch looking me in the face that need help, and if I give to them I won't have enough to take care of the families I am obligated to care for until another crop is made.

"I hope this appeal will reach those of you who have something and are willing to give it. These people here in Autaugaville have helped make Montgomery what it is to-day. I make two trips a week to Montgomery to buy supplies for my store. I buy about 98 per cent of my supplies from Montgomery merchants.

"I am not asking for money, but if you have any kind of food-stuffs that you can give these people, I will be very glad to go to Montgomery in my truck and bring it to these folks who are really needing it.

"Tuesday I went to a packinghouse in Montgomery to get some merchandise for my store and saw a bunch of empty lard buckets with some lard sticking on the walls. They gave me those empty buckets to bring home, and I in turn gave them away to the people here who needed it. So to-night there will be a little grease in their bread instead of having to eat it dry.

"One of your firms in Montgomery gave a charitable organization 80 pounds of coffee, and they didn't think enough of the gift to go and get it. I wish some firm would make me that offer, and then come down here and watch me give it to these hungry folks. If you have a little flour that is a little musty or has some bugs in it, don't hesitate to offer it to me, for it will be appreciated and fill an empty stomach.

"I will say to the firm or person who gives me anything for our people here, they will surely be repaid for it, for I will give that firm enough free advertising to pay them. You folks who know me know I will do it. If you are interested and want to help me, just write me what you have to give and I will come by and get it. Remember, now, that I am not working for the Post Office Department, and do not write me a lot of letters that require answering, for that 2-cent stamp will help feed a family."

"E. H. PEARSON,
"Autaugaville, Ala."

I bring that to the attention of the House and stress the importance of rushing relief to the people of our State, and, as for that, all the States which are in need. I also bring to the attention of the House, in view of the fact that it has been stated from time to time that whenever there was a move made to make an extra appropriation to give the people of our country relief or lend money for food that the Red Cross had plenty of money to handle this situation and was handling it. That was told from time to time before Christmas. Some Members of Congress have written Judge Payne asking him what his organization was doing for relief. I, for one, did this in reference to work being done in my State.

He replied that he could not give a summary of it, but did admit that there had been one little place in my district that had had some assistance. The country is now asked to contribute \$10,000,000 to help out in this great emergency caused by the drought and unemployment. I consider that a worthy appeal. I do consider the amount asked inadequate, and I think we are going to find that out further along.

But I particularly come before this House to refer to something that transpired some time ago. About 15 months ago we had a drop in the stock market in New York City, something that I know but little about from personal observation. A few weeks later the Administration recommended on the floor of the House to return under the guise of a tax reduction \$160,000,000 to the wealthy taxpayers. That was highly recommended and it passed this House without a record vote on the 5th of December, 1929. It was done to stimulate business as I understand it—to help over the crisis. For myself I have never considered that a tax reduction. I consider that after 12 months of 1929 which had passed and in view of this fact, that those who were at the head of these big corporations and business concerns had taken the money out of the employees and had placed it aside, as reason would show that they had, for that purpose it was not a tax reduction, but it was a gift to the wealthy people of this country. I am glad that there were men on the floor of this House who strongly opposed that measure. I challenge any man on the floor of the House to get up and defend a measure like that and

at the same time take the position some have on the measures that we have had before us to relieve suffering and unemployment with people suffering from the lack of the necessities of life. I don't know what the purpose was in giving back that tax money, but I do believe that it is unfair and unjust to take that position in the face of what we have now in this country and the contrary in reference to relief so much needed.

I have an article here that I clipped yesterday from the little News, published here in Washington. Perhaps I am wrong in using that word "little," for it may be a very big newspaper. I used the same expression in reference to a paper not long since and was criticized for it.

Mr. KVALE. The gentleman's reference to the paper as little was to its physical size.

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. COLLINS. Does not the gentleman think that it is the best-edited paper in the District of Columbia?

Mr. PATTERSON. Well, I take it regularly.

Mr. COLLINS. I do, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. PATTERSON. I am not a judge. A little while ago I saw the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], who has been looking after the reds, and I was anxious for him to be here, because I noticed something in the paper the other day which encouraged me and that was that he was recommending some reformation in other lines, along the lines of big business in this country. This article to which I refer says:

During the first nine months of 1930 when dividends increased by more than a billion dollars over the 1929 dividends, the wages paid to the working people declined \$8,800,000,000.

I challenge any man to get up and defend the operation of a system which perpetrates such a thing as that on the country. It seems that, whenever there comes a loss and a depression, the wage earners, farmers, and the common people are made to bear the burden of it. It is not right and fair. Talk about overproduction of farm products and overproduction of this and the other! I do not believe there is any such thing, and in my judgment there never will be an overproduction of the products of the farm or anything else as long as there are eight or ten million people in our country who are hungry. It is underconsumption. This article goes on further to say that at the present time it is safe to say that the wages paid to the wage earners and salaried people in 1930 were lower by \$10,000,000,000 than they were in 1929. And surely in 1929 they were low enough. The other day when we were discussing the Wood amendment in respect to the appropriation bill, I made the point that the way to solve depression and remove the great inequalities in this country is not by reducing wages, but that we should increase wages and thereby get a more equitable division of income among the great masses of the people.

The people who toil and produce on farms and in factories and others in this country are hungry and lack many of the necessities of life, and it is necessary to help them and help them now. This is particularly true in my State and my district, and I plead earnestly in their interest for help. They are starving, as this article indicates. I am glad I can ask this in their name. I am sorry that such a system has come about, and then in addition to this the great drought affected direly every county in my district. I have received hundreds of letters, where their corn and other crops were cut off, many of them 80 or 90 per cent.

Then one other thing we need, and that is the extension of time on those farm-loan notes which are due. I will say just here that you could not perpetrate a greater crime against the farmer than to take his home from him at a time like this. Especially is this true of a Government agency. So we hope to get a bill passed postponing these payments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURNETT].

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am going to address myself this afternoon to a bill that I introduced on January 5, H. R. 15595, to place a temporary embargo on certain agricultural products. I think most of you who are here this afternoon will recall that Mr. Alexander Legge, chairman of the Federal Farm Board, a few weeks ago, in a public speech, recommended that an embargo be placed upon wheat.

That statement attracted the attention of the country. It attracted my attention. I concede that at first blush I thought there was little to the suggestion. But I went to work upon the general subject, not only with reference to wheat but also to a few other farm products, and thereupon reached different conclusions.

Another member of the Farm Board, the Hon. Samuel R. McKelvie, more particularly representing the wheat regions, agrees with Chairman Legge. Permit me to quote from an article which appeared in the January 5 issue of the United States Daily, as follows:

Some action is desirable to prevent the importation of wheat and feedstuffs into the United States over the tariff, and operation of the flexible tariff law is too slow, so that congressional action may be necessary, Samuel R. McKelvie, member of the Federal Farm Board, representing grain growers, stated orally January 3.

Two of the possible actions which Congress may take, Mr. McKelvie said, are to increase the tariff or to place an embargo on the imports. He added, however, that he did not wish to suggest to Congress what action it might take, that being a question solely for Congress to decide.

Mill feeds and corn are coming into the United States from foreign countries in considerable quantities, Mr. McKelvie said. Shipments have arrived from South Africa, Argentina, Manchuria, and other countries. The imports of feedstuffs are hurting American millers, Mr. McKelvie said, since the Americans lose the milling business which they might receive if the grains were milled in the United States rather than abroad.

The flexible tariff law, Mr. McKelvie said, provides that an investigation of foreign costs of production must be made before a higher tariff is recommended to the President by the Tariff Commission. Such an investigation in the case of agricultural products would take many months, he added, since figures on costs are not kept by farmers generally to an extent comparable with the compilation of statistics of industrial costs.

The small millers and elevator operators in the Southwest, particularly Kansas, are beginning to complain more than usual that they have not as much wheat in their bins as they would like to carry, Mr. McKelvie said. A similar situation usually develops at this season and wheat is moved back from the larger markets to supply the need, he added, but the condition appears to be more accentuated this year than usual.

I was induced to introduce this bill because of the very depressed prices now prevailing on wheat, feed grains, and butter caused in part by the threat of foreign importations.

I might first say that I do not believe in an embargo as permanent legislation. Tariff duties should constitute sufficient protection under normal conditions, providing the duties are high enough to represent the difference in the cost of production within the United States and principal competing countries.

However, these are not normal times. An emergency exists with reference to many farm prices. In my judgment the situation is so serious as to warrant unusual temporary measures that may be helpful in making it possible for farmers to save their homes, as well as in rehabilitating the purchasing power of agriculture, which would in turn accrue to the benefit of labor and capital engaged in other industries.

For this reason I propose an embargo until March 1, 1932, on three classes of farm crops and products: First, on wheat and flour; second, on feed grains, including corn, barley, oats, bran, mixed feeds of all sorts, including screenings—as rye can be substituted both for feed and for human consumption, I include rye, rye flour, and meal; third, butter, oleomargarine, and other butter substitutes.

It will be noted that I have included nothing of which we do not have ample in the United States for domestic consumption and nothing as to which the present price is not most deplorable. The American farmers are entitled to the American markets.

I am not taking the market away from foreign producers in any case where we have not ample production at home for domestic consumption at less than reasonable prices.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Does the gentleman include an embargo on cattle?

Mr. BURTNESS. I have not included cattle. That raises so many troublesome and controversial questions and would not come strictly within the tests I have laid down here, at least not definitely enough to include them. It would not do to include too many things, for that would surely defeat the measure.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman state how much wheat is being imported for domestic use?

Mr. BURTNESS. I will come to that later in my remarks if I have the time.

I already mentioned Mr. Legge's position. I sent Mr. Legge a copy of this bill under date of January 8, accompanied by my own letter, as follows:

JANUARY 8, 1931.

HON. ALEXANDER LEGGE,

Chairman Federal Farm Board, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LEGGE: I inclose herewith a copy of the bill H. R. 15595 and a short statement by way of explanation thereof.

I would appreciate having the benefit of such comments as you may care to make thereon, confidential or otherwise.

Very sincerely yours,

O. B. BURTNESS.

Mr. Legge's reply will give you the attitude of the man who, as the head of the Farm Board, has probably studied these problems more carefully than any other person in the United States. It also shows that other products than wheat should be included, and thus sustains the independent conclusions I reached.

The letter is as follows:

FEDERAL FARM BOARD,
Washington, January 14, 1931.

HON. O. B. BURTNESS,

House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Replying to your letter of January 8, would say that I certainly hope the present Congress will pass some measure of relief which will protect the American farmer against the present world-wide depression in the prices of agricultural commodities.

Just how this relief is to be afforded is perhaps not material. Some time ago, in writing Senator CAPPER, I suggested that unless there was an improvement in world conditions we would ask for a temporary embargo on wheat imports. However, just as strong an argument could be made to-day on other grains, including beans. Some of these commodities are coming into the country on a basis that seems as though the price obtained for them would hardly pay the cost of transportation from the areas in which they are produced.

So far there has been no improvement in world prices. Many students of the situation seem to think that there is a probability that they will go still lower. I, therefore, hope that before the present Congress adjourns they will find it possible to pass such legislation as will protect the American producer during this period of distress.

I think the bill that you have introduced is along the right line as affording perhaps the quickest method of dealing with the situation. However, it is immaterial to us just how this result is arrived at, but present conditions certainly justify action on the part of Congress to meet the present emergency.

Yours very truly,

ALEX. LEGGE,
Chairman Federal Farm Board.

Now, that letter is indicative of the kind of support the bill is receiving. Do not forget what Mr. Legge says about the dangerous trend of world prices and the present emergency demanding action.

I also have letters from the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Dairy Union, and others, which I will not take the time to read, but will add some of them by way of extension, if I obtain permission so to do.

While it is true that importations have not been exceedingly large, it is also equally true that the threat of importations has seriously affected the market. Let me illustrate by the case of butter.

Butter, 92 score, was 37 cents at New York on July 31. The usual seasonal rise started and the price reached 40 cents on August 28 and remained at about that figure through September and October. Normally we should have seen a continuing rising price level till the end of December.

However, in the month of October New Zealand butter dropped in the London market to less than 25 cents, making the spread between New York and London about 15 cents, or 1 cent more than the tariff. Some importations were made, which probably had their effect. More serious, however, was the threat of importations, with the result that American prices declined to a figure so low that importations were not possible. By November 27 the price at New York had been reduced to 34 cents, New Zealand butter at London in the meantime declining to less than 22 cents. It is this threat I desire to remove until normal conditions are restored. The price of New Zealand butter may continue to decline, aggravating the situation still further. Butter has continued to drop in price since I obtained these figures.

Now as to feed grains, the second class of products as to which I urge an embargo, the market price of barley in my State has been running from 20 to 25 cents a bushel, oats at 19 and 20 cents, and rye about the same as barley. In spite of these disgustingly low and unfair prices feedstuffs have been imported, particularly from Canada and Argentina. Such importations include corn, barley, and a large amount of bran, shorts, and mixed feeds. Feed barley has been sold across the Canadian border from my State for as low as 4 cents per bushel and good grade barley at from 10 to 12 cents.

The importations of bran, shorts, and other by-products of wheat as it is ground during October and November averaged an equivalent of 4,395,300 bushels of oats. The duty charged on these by-products of wheat is only 10 per cent ad valorem and, of course, when the price drops to as low as \$5 per ton on some screenings a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem amounts to little or nothing. An embargo on these by-product feeds would save the American market for the barley, corn, and oats and the wheat by-products raised by our own American producers on American farms.

Now, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMMERS] asked with reference to the importation of wheat. Just now they are only nominal. The proposed embargo on wheat and wheat flour might well be of much greater benefit when the 1931 crop is harvested and marketed than it would be just now. At present American wheat prices are about 20 cents higher than Canadian prices. I am not urging an embargo on wheat because of the effect it will have during the next few weeks, but I am concerned about what the marketing year of 1931 is going to bring about. You heard Mr. Legge's letter, where he said in effect that he fears that world prices are going down still farther, and if the Farm Board is unable to maintain American prices above world prices the farmers of Kansas, Oklahoma, North Dakota, and other wheat States will probably receive only about 35 cents per bushel for their wheat next fall. That is all we would receive now if our wheat were shipped to Liverpool.

You must not forget the situation we have throughout the world. Neither do you want to overlook the Russian situation. During the five years immediately prior to 1930 the Russian exports of wheat probably did not amount to more than 10,000,000 bushels, on the average, annually, but during this past year, 1930, it is estimated that their exports amounted to 100,000,000 bushels.

I see the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], who has been at the head of a committee investigating this matter, nodding his head. I have not consulted with him about it, but I deem his nods as corroboration of my figures. Exact figures can not be obtained. The best students and observers also tell us that in all probability Russia will sell in her export trade this coming season 250,000,000 bushels of wheat. What will that mean? Of course, it will absolutely deprive the American farmer of the European market. There is no question about that, but just as serious an effect will be the fact that the Russian wheat will probably also deprive the Canadian wheat farmers of the European market.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BURTNESS. When Russian wheat takes the European market away from the Canadian wheat farmer, where is he going to look to for the disposal of his grain? There is only one place and that is the United States. The situation with reference to Canadian wheat, then, will probably be about the same as it was in Canada this fall with reference to barley. Wheat will possibly be selling for almost as little as barley did this fall. In any event, the selling pressure will be tremendous. The only outlet for Canadian wheat may be the American market, and that is the reason why, before Congress adjourns on March 4, it seems so vitally necessary, for the protection of this coming season's crop and the price our farmers are to receive therefor, that something be done to keep out foreign production. We do not need the foreign wheat, and its introduction will produce a tremendous amount of harm.

There is another reason for an embargo on wheat, and that is in order to maintain protein premiums. Because of the dry season last year we had a large protein content of wheat throughout the entire United States, with the result that no protein premiums are being paid for the 1930 crop. If, however, this next season should be different, so that there is a high-protein content in some sections and a low-protein content in other sections, there will again be substantial protein premiums. If general American markets are sustained by the Farm Board as at present at 20 cents above Canadian markets, the maximum protein premiums that could be paid without any danger of large Canadian importations would be about 20 cents. So in order to protect those protein premiums it is important to keep out Canadian wheat in the coming season, for most of you know that in seasons more or less unusual protein premiums may amount to as much as 40 or 50 cents a bushel on the highest-protein wheat. That is in years when the Canadian and American markets are on about the same level. They can then run up to the full amount of the tariff. When general prices are maintained above the world price for any reason the maximum-protein premium becomes that much less.

I think it is well to send word to the wheat farmers of the country and tell them the truth about the situation, and tell them that their export possibilities in the future are such that there is no reasonable hope to expect a profitable price in the export trade. It simply is not in the picture. Of course, they should, if they possibly can, cut their production to an amount such as can be reasonably consumed here in the United States. But that is not easy and presents another problem which I will not go into now.

In connection with the bill I have proposed I want to emphasize this, that as far as I can see, it can not possibly hurt anyone. We have the grain and the products here; our consumers can obtain them all at reasonable prices; it will not cost the Government a cent and I do not think it will cost anybody else anything. I believe it will help to rehabilitate the purchasing power of agriculture in some sections and if it does that it will help rehabilitate the purchasing power of labor throughout the country as a whole. It is not a cure-all but many sections would be benefited.

Mr. GLOVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes.

Mr. GLOVER. Will the gentleman please name the principal things on which he would place an embargo?

Mr. BURTNESS. My bill, as I have said, divides the products into three general classes. I have not the time to read the technical descriptions which follow the language of the tariff act, but answering the gentleman, my bill places an embargo on wheat and wheat flour, feed grains of all sorts, including corn, oats, barley, rye, wheat by-products, such as bran, and so forth, and all of those that enter into feed for cattle, and the third class of products is butter and butter substitutes. Perhaps other things should be included. Maybe there are some things in my bill that ought not to be included. That will become a question, first, for consideration by the committee in hearings and later by the House. I have avoided the controversial question of vegetable oils,

for that would throw us into a discussion of the whole Philippine question.

Some ask, Why not increase the duties? This is a fair question. Congress, however, will not now disturb the tariff rates, so the only procedure remaining in that respect is to use the so-called flexible provisions of the tariff act. These are not practical for the purpose for two reasons.

The first reason is that it takes too long a time to do so. The Tariff Commission and the President have no power to change duties without a detailed study into the costs of production in this and in principal competing countries. Experience shows that this ordinarily takes from two to four years.

The second reason is that we have no evidence and no assurance that the facts disclosed by the required investigations would warrant increases rather than decreases under the provisions of the tariff act. These officials have no discretion to raise duties unless it is found that the present rates do not cover the difference in the cost of production. For instance, in the case of wheat, who can say that it costs even more than 42 cents additional to raise a bushel thereof in the United States than in Canada? When that figure was determined by the commission and the President a few years ago, the average costs for the preceding three years were used as a basis therefor. Those happened to be years when yields were relatively high in Canada. I for one do not favor risking the hazard that would be involved in another investigation at this time.

Most of these duties are probably ample in normal times. The one outstanding exception is the rate on bran, shorts, mixed feeds, screenings, and so forth, but this rate is on an ad valorem basis; namely, 10 per cent. The maximum increase that could be granted under the law would give us a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem and would constitute little or no relief. This rate should be increased at the earliest opportunity by act of Congress.

Before closing I do want to urge those of you who have listened to my remarks, and if you believe in my conclusions, to cooperate with me in securing, just as early as possible, a hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means because the time is short.

Mr. SELVIG. When does the gentleman expect to have hearings held on his bill?

Mr. BURTNESS. Just as soon as it is possible to induce the committee to hold them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has again expired.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by inserting copies of the letters to which I have referred and also three or four tables, one showing the market prices of butter over a given period, and the others are tables relating to the importation of various commodities, as well as a short editorial relating to my bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the letters referred to; also certain tables and a short editorial. Is there objection?

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I object to the editorial.

Mr. BURTNESS. I wonder if the gentleman would care to look at the editorial before he objects?

Mr. SPROUL of Illinois. I must be consistent. We have been objecting to these editorial articles and magazine articles for the past two years, and I would not be consistent if I allowed the gentleman's editorial to go into the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Dakota desire to modify his request?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes; by omitting the editorial.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing certain letters and certain tables. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTNESS. The following are the letters and tables for which extension was granted:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 14, 1931.

HON. O. B. BURTNESS, M. C.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURTNESS: Your bill, H. R. 15595, to place an embargo on certain agricultural products, is of good intent and would be helpful to many groups of agricultural producers in our Nation if it could be enacted.

I have read with interest your statement in relation to this measure and note that you have specified a number of commodities which are now in need of greater protection against foreign competition than is to be secured even from the newer and higher rates in the tariff law of 1930.

It occurs to me, on account of the impending and increased competition from foreign vegetable oils, particularly palm oil, that you might improve your bill by adding foreign vegetable oils to your list of products.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
CHESTER H. GRAY,
Washington Representative.

THE NATIONAL DAIRY UNION,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY,
Washington, January 14, 1931.

HON. O. B. BURTNESS,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURTNESS: My attention has been called to your recently introduced bill (H. R. 15595) which provides for an embargo on certain commodities of which we have an ample supply in the United States for all normal needs.

In view of the emergency situation which confronts practically every agricultural industry and many other domestic industries engaged in the production of what we term "raw materials" I can see no harm and much good in the temporary application of the principle used in your bill.

In the dairy industry at the present time we are confronted by a situation which would make the receipt of imports of butter a very serious blow to dairy prices which have already broken to a point which is ruinous to the dairy industry of the United States. While butter imports are not large they are in sufficient quantity to measure the difference between adequate supply and that kind of an oversupply which ruins the farmers' markets.

Permit me to add, however, that in this particular field of dairy prices our most serious trouble comes from imports of cheap vegetable oils. These cheap vegetable oils are made by American manufacturers into substitutes for American farm products—that is, into oleomargarine, salad oils and salad dressings, and lard and cooking compounds—and perhaps a greater benefit would come to the dairy industry if there could be an embargo upon these imported vegetable oils and the materials from which they are made. This embargo in order to be effective must also apply to those imports which come from the Philippine Islands, which is the largest single source of domestic imports of vegetable oils. As a temporary expedient paving the way for an orderly and systematic relief which will give to domestic producers the first chance at the whole domestic market your bill would certainly be wise legislation.

Yours sincerely,

NATIONAL DAIRY UNION,
A. M. LOOMIS, Secretary.

Butter: Weekly wholesale prices at New York and London, 1930
[In cents per pound]

| Week | New York, 92 score | London, ¹ New Zealand | London, ¹ Danish | Spread between New York prices and London prices of— | |
|---------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--------|
| | | | | New Zealand | Danish |
| July 31..... | 37.00 | 29.98 | 33.67 | 7.02 | 3.33 |
| Aug. 7..... | 37.50 | 29.55 | 32.37 | 7.95 | 5.13 |
| Aug. 14..... | 39.50 | 29.44 | 32.15 | 9.06 | 7.35 |
| Aug. 21..... | 39.25 | 28.35 | 31.28 | 10.90 | 7.97 |
| Aug. 28..... | 40.00 | 27.59 | 31.39 | 12.41 | 8.61 |
| Sept. 4..... | 39.50 | 27.27 | 31.94 | 11.23 | 7.56 |
| Sept. 11..... | 39.50 | 27.37 | 33.46 | 11.13 | 6.04 |
| Sept. 18..... | 40.50 | 28.13 | 32.81 | 12.37 | 7.69 |
| Sept. 25..... | 39.00 | 27.59 | 32.26 | 11.41 | 6.74 |
| Oct. 2..... | 40.00 | 26.07 | 31.94 | 13.93 | 8.06 |
| Oct. 9..... | 40.00 | 24.55 | 31.50 | 15.45 | 8.50 |
| Oct. 16..... | 40.00 | 25.42 | 32.81 | 14.58 | 7.19 |
| Oct. 23..... | 40.00 | 24.98 | 34.11 | 15.02 | 5.89 |
| Oct. 30..... | 39.50 | 24.33 | 33.24 | 15.17 | 6.26 |
| Nov. 6..... | 38.50 | 24.33 | 30.85 | 14.17 | 7.65 |
| Nov. 13..... | 36.50 | 24.01 | 30.63 | 12.49 | 5.87 |
| Nov. 20..... | 34.50 | 23.25 | 30.20 | 11.25 | 4.30 |
| Nov. 27..... | 34.00 | 21.94 | 28.46 | 12.06 | 5.54 |
| Dec. 4..... | 36.50 | 22.60 | 28.46 | 13.90 | 8.04 |

¹ Quotations for following day.

TABLE 1.—Imports of bran, shorts, and other by-product feeds of wheat into the United States, July–November, 1926–1930¹
[In long tons]

| Year | Monthly | | | | | Cumulative from July 1 through— | | | | |
|-----------|---------|--------|-----------|---------|----------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------|----------|--|
| | July | August | September | October | November | August | September | October | November | |
| 1926..... | 24,694 | 10,938 | 13,240 | 21,765 | 20,486 | 35,632 | 48,872 | 70,637 | 91,123 | |
| 1927..... | 9,201 | 10,892 | 18,682 | 24,454 | 30,888 | 20,093 | 38,775 | 63,229 | 94,117 | |
| 1928..... | 22,625 | 30,184 | 19,420 | 34,802 | 32,894 | 62,809 | 82,229 | 117,031 | 149,925 | |
| 1929..... | 20,698 | 22,148 | 10,823 | 10,622 | 10,167 | 42,846 | 53,069 | 64,331 | 74,498 | |
| 1930..... | 34,105 | 34,545 | 34,771 | 66,702 | 58,578 | 68,650 | 103,421 | 170,123 | 229,001 | |

DIRECT IMPORTATIONS²

| Year | July | August | September | October | November | August | September | October | November |
|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|---------|----------|--------|-----------|---------|----------|
| 1926..... | 13,528 | 7,075 | 8,465 | 13,219 | 20,486 | 20,603 | 29,063 | 42,287 | 62,773 |
| 1927..... | 3,755 | 5,727 | 5,560 | 19,232 | 17,836 | 9,482 | 15,042 | 34,274 | 52,110 |
| 1928..... | 15,614 | 13,703 | 19,304 | 13,822 | 22,028 | 29,317 | 48,621 | 62,443 | 84,471 |
| 1929..... | 16,999 | 9,989 | 6,635 | 4,616 | 5,667 | 26,988 | 33,623 | 38,232 | 43,905 |
| 1930..... | 34,105 | 30,000 | 34,771 | 47,256 | 34,296 | 64,105 | 98,876 | 146,132 | 180,428 |

WITHDRAWN FROM BONDED MILLS³

| Year | July | August | September | October | November | August | September | October | November |
|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|---------|----------|--------|-----------|---------|----------|
| 1926..... | 11,166 | 3,853 | 4,775 | 8,546 | 0 | 15,029 | 19,804 | 28,350 | 28,350 |
| 1927..... | 5,446 | 5,165 | 13,122 | 5,222 | 13,052 | 10,611 | 23,733 | 28,955 | 42,007 |
| 1928..... | 17,011 | 16,481 | 116 | 20,980 | 10,866 | 33,492 | 33,608 | 54,588 | 65,454 |

¹ Not reported separately before Sept. 22, 1922, when a tariff duty became effective.
² Not reported separately before Jan. 1, 1926.

United States—Imports wheat bran (long tons)

| From— | January | February | March | April | May | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Total |
|--------------------------|---------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|---------|----------|----------|---------|
| 1929 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Canada..... | 22,274 | 17,820 | 14,290 | 12,843 | 15,417 | 12,212 | 16,626 | 9,393 | 6,039 | 4,174 | 5,107 | 3,002 | 139,197 |
| Honduras..... | 48 | 26 | | | 16 | 36 | 48 | | 59 | 46 | | | 279 |
| Mexico..... | 417 | 264 | 223 | 56 | 90 | 235 | 325 | 594 | 537 | 392 | 590 | 644 | 4,339 |
| Dominican Republic..... | | | | | 9 | | | | | 4 | | 4 | 17 |
| Japan..... | | | | | | 44 | | | | | | | 44 |
| Total..... | 22,739 | 18,110 | 14,515 | 12,900 | 15,532 | 12,537 | 16,999 | 9,989 | 6,635 | 4,616 | 5,667 | 3,650 | 143,877 |
| Withdrawn from bond..... | 28,242 | 11,997 | 11,501 | 12,841 | 4,123 | 22,240 | 3,699 | 13,159 | 4,183 | 6,046 | 4,500 | 7,453 | 128,987 |
| 1930 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Belgium..... | | | | | | | 348 | 196 | | | | | 544 |
| France..... | | | | | | | 1,447 | 1,181 | 300 | 1,649 | | | 4,577 |
| Germany..... | | | | | 149 | 651 | 224 | 801 | 201 | 50 | | | 2,076 |
| Greece..... | | | | | | 656 | 300 | 684 | | | | | 1,640 |
| Netherlands..... | | | | | | | 440 | | | 500 | | | 940 |
| Canada..... | 122 | 74 | 787 | 1,588 | 1,275 | 8,860 | 16,082 | 14,101 | 17,557 | 28,195 | 21,163 | | 109,802 |
| Honduras..... | 122 | 89 | 90 | 27 | 34 | 66 | 89 | 45 | 89 | 170 | | | 821 |
| Mexico..... | 332 | 282 | 272 | 213 | 175 | 275 | 189 | 270 | 250 | 207 | 131 | | 2,596 |
| Dominican Republic..... | | 8 | 5 | 4 | 9 | | 4 | 9 | 8 | | | | 47 |
| Argentina..... | 208 | 2,395 | 3,001 | 6,777 | 7,220 | 8,642 | 12,369 | 11,939 | 15,759 | 15,256 | 12,030 | | 95,686 |
| Brazil..... | | | | | 1,200 | 416 | 2,613 | 774 | 601 | 1,103 | 702 | | 7,409 |
| Turkey..... | | | | | | | | | | 298 | | | 298 |
| Paraguay..... | | | | | | | | | | | 100 | | 100 |
| Total..... | 874 | 2,848 | 4,155 | 8,609 | 10,062 | 19,566 | 34,105 | 30,000 | 34,771 | 47,256 | 34,296 | | 226,542 |
| Withdrawn from bond..... | 8,845 | | 11,596 | 14,263 | 7,118 | 27,921 | | 4,545 | | 19,446 | 24,582 | | 118,316 |

Compiled by Felix T. Pope.

Canada: Exports of barley to the United States, June–November, 1929 and 1930

| Month | 1929 | 1930 |
|----------------|--------|---------|
| June..... | 106 | 45 |
| August..... | 84,006 | 1,250 |
| September..... | 50 | 111,108 |
| October..... | | 321,149 |
| November..... | 1,298 | 125,557 |

Compiled from Trade of Canada.

The Dec. 12, 1930, issue of Canadian grain statistics gives shipments of barley to United States from Aug. 1–Dec. 1 as 559,000 bushels.

United States: Value of imports of "all other" grains and preparations, June–November, 1929 and 1930¹

| Month | 1929 | 1930 |
|----------------|----------|----------|
| June..... | \$25,574 | \$89,207 |
| July..... | 12,194 | 10,722 |
| August..... | 12,742 | 37,402 |
| September..... | 28,194 | 27,054 |
| October..... | 27,979 | 62,295 |
| November..... | 31,479 | 271,125 |
| | | 215,668 |

¹ This includes barley, buckwheat flour and grits, cereal breakfast foods and preparations, cracked corn, corn meal, flour grits and similar products, semolina, crushed, cracked, and other wheat products, oatmeal, grits and similar products, rye, rye malt, rye flour and meal, other grains, and grain flours.

² June 1–17.
³ June 18–30.

Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce of the United States.

TABLE 1.—Imports of bran, shorts, and other by-product feeds of wheat into the United States, July–November, 1926–1930—Con.

WITHDRAWN FROM BONDED MILLS—continued

| Year | Monthly | | | | | Cumulative from July 1 through— | | | | |
|-----------|---------|--------|-----------|---------|----------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------|----------|--|
| | July | August | September | October | November | August | September | October | November | |
| 1929..... | 3,699 | 12,159 | 4,188 | 6,046 | 4,500 | 15,853 | 20,046 | 26,092 | 30,592 | |
| 1930..... | 0 | 4,545 | 0 | 19,446 | 24,582 | 4,545 | 4,545 | 23,991 | 48,573 | |

Source: Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce of the United States, and latest data from Foodstuffs Division, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

TABLE 2.—Direct importations of bran, shorts, etc., by countries of export, July–November, 1930
[In long tons]

| Exporting country | Monthly | | | | | Cumulative from July 1 through— | | | | |
|----------------------|---------|--------|-----------|---------|----------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------|----------|--|
| | July | August | September | October | November | August | September | October | November | |
| Canada..... | 16,082 | 14,101 | 17,557 | 28,193 | 21,163 | 30,183 | 47,740 | 75,933 | 97,095 | |
| Argentina..... | 12,369 | 11,939 | 15,759 | 15,256 | 12,030 | 24,308 | 40,067 | 55,323 | 67,353 | |
| Brazil..... | 2,613 | 774 | 601 | 1,103 | 702 | 3,387 | 3,988 | 5,091 | 5,793 | |
| France..... | 1,447 | 1,181 | 300 | 1,649 | | 2,628 | 2,928 | 4,577 | 4,577 | |
| Other countries..... | 1,594 | 2,005 | 554 | 1,055 | 401 | 3,599 | 4,153 | 5,168 | 5,569 | |
| Total..... | 34,105 | 30,000 | 34,771 | 47,256 | 34,296 | 64,105 | 98,876 | 146,132 | 180,428 | |

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, chiefly from Foodstuffs Round the World.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMMERS].

Mr. SUMMERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I do not want to be in the attitude of being opposed to the bill of the gentleman who has just addressed you. I am deeply sympathetic with reference to the situation in which the wheat farmers of the Northwest find themselves, but I am wondering if the remedy proposed by the gentleman can reach the difficulty in which his farmers find themselves.

EMBARGO ON WHEAT RIDICULOUS

For another purpose, I had an examination made with regard to the importations of wheat during the last year. The importation of wheat for domestic use from the beginning of the season until the close, or until the 1st of November, was only 2,000 bushels. At no time has the foreign price got within 20 cents of the limit of the tariff against the importation of wheat.

Mr. BURTNESS. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SUMMERS of Texas. So there is a margin now of 20 cents in the tariff on wheat, making impossible, naturally, the importation of any considerable amount of foreign wheat into this country.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; very briefly.

Mr. BURTNESS. That is true as to the margin against Canada, but it is not true with reference to the margin that exists if Canada also gets down strictly to the Liverpool market. The difference between Liverpool and Chicago now is almost as much as the tariff.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I repeat the statement, and I think it is approximately correct, that the wheat farmers of the Northwest are now protected against any substantial importation of wheat, by a margin of about 20 cents on their wheat.

NOT DEALING WITH TEMPORARY SITUATION

My judgment is we are not dealing with a temporary situation. To the situation in which we find ourselves now there have been many contributing causes; yet I believe every student of this situation appreciates the fact that in so far as this country is concerned our present difficulty began with the paralysis of the debt-paying and purchasing power of the producers of exportable agricultural surpluses.

Ordinarily a physician seeking to diagnose a case and seeking to devise a remedy wants to know the history of the case, how it got started. With the application of steam, electricity, and gasoline there came an economic and industrial revolution to the earth which interrelated all the industries and all the sections of the country, so that each became a part of the other; and while it can not be said with any degree of accuracy that this or that or the other business is the basic business, yet in a peculiar sense to America agriculture is a basic business. It is impossible to maintain any general prosperity in America when the producers of agricultural commodities are not able to buy, and eighty-odd per cent of the acreage of American agriculture is used in the production of those commodities which in turn produce exportable surpluses. So it may be said, as a general proposition, that you can not have prosperity in America when the debt-paying and purchasing power of the producers of exportable agricultural surpluses is paralyzed.

DOUBLE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AGRICULTURE

I am not going to make a partisan speech this afternoon. We have reached the end of the road, in my judgment. We started from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean, having in front of us a territory of remarkable fertility. Railroads began to develop in the country. Different from any other great migration or development in history, these railroads made it possible for large groups of people to go immediately into vast, fertile territory. About this time this Government said—and I am addressing myself to everybody, irrespective of politics, because we have got to meet this irrespective of politics—about this time the Government declared the general policy of protecting its people from competition with the cheap labor and the low-living conditions of the rest of the world.

This was a general policy declared by this Government, but when it came to apply that policy it excluded the producers of agricultural surpluses from the benefits of the policy.

Of course, we have an unusual condition in America to-day, but if you will make a little examination with regard to your wheat importations back behind this period, when we are giving this bounty of \$500,000,000, you will find that as a rule the American market for wheat—for instance, your own Duluth market—did not exceed the Winnipeg market because we had moving out from this country 200,000,000 bushels of wheat per annum. We had moving out of this country \$325,000,000 worth of tobacco and over half of our cotton production. So the movement being outward, I think it is recognized by all students, and admitted by all honest people now, that you can not protect by a tariff producers of any commodity where you have a very large movement out to the competitive markets of the world. I think everybody recognizes that now.

I want to illustrate this. The best way to study a big question, I think, is to study it in the miniature. When a chemist wants to find out the composition of an article he takes a sample here and there, but when the House wants to study a question the disposition is to run the simple question into the big complicated one.

Let us take an illustration: The laws of nature are universal. Economic laws are laws of nature. Suppose a parent has four children and he says, "Now, I am going to protect you children against the cheap labor of your neighbors." But when it comes to apply the policy he says, "I am going to make it work with reference to two of you only. I am going to establish a policy so that two will get the benefits of the policy and the other two will not." So he excludes two from the benefit of the policy. Well that would be pretty bad. But if, in addition, he says to the excluded two, "You have to pay a part of what you get competing with your neighbors to boost the price which the other two are getting," well, that would be doubly bad. Pretty soon the two still compelled to compete with their neighbors and compelled to provide the bounty which raised the price of their brethren would get where they could not buy from their brethren. Their brethren would have all the money, and stagnation would ensue. But that is exactly what the Government is doing between those whose prices are increased by the tariff system and the producers of agricultural exportable surplus, and the thing has happened in the Nation which would have happened among those four brothers. That is a fact that nobody can deny.

The products—cotton, wheat, and tobacco—are raised to-day in competition with the cheapest labor in the world, and when these farmers bring back what they get from sales made in competition with the cheapest labor in the world the Government compels them to give a part of what they receive in competition with the cheapest labor to boost the prices paid to those whom the Government seeks to benefit by a protective tariff. The remarkable thing is that the system has stood up as long as it has. The explanation is to be found chiefly in our virgin soil.

RESULT OF THE DISCRIMINATION

We talk about how much richer we have got in this country, we have gone across the country like a swarm of devastating locusts.

We have gone into new fields, new ground, and robbed and robbed it until it ceases to produce a profit and then we go and get some more new ground. That process has been going on from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean until we are at the end of the road.

You people who live in the cities and depend upon the farmer do not doubt that. If you do, you are making a serious mistake.

While the farmers have been bled in order to stimulate manufactures, the farmers have been bleeding the soil. We are at the end of that bleeding process. Both the soil and the farmers are bled white. The paralysis which began with the farmers is extending to other parts of the economic body. The country has plenty of money. New York can not lend its money at 3 per cent. The farmers can not sell wheat at the cost of production. The farmers in my country can not sell cotton at the cost of production. Of course, conditions are bad.

I do not want to tire you this afternoon, but I am talking about something that I know concerns all of you. What I am talking about is as important to you of the great cities as the destruction of the roots of a tree would be important to the branches of the tree or the fruit. In a definite sense these producers of agricultural surpluses are the root. That is where the sap comes from, particularly in my country.

My people can not buy. How can your factories sell? You have plenty of factories; you have plenty of people to work in them. When you have a situation in any country where you have plenty of money, plenty of food and clothing materials, plenty of factories, plenty of people to work in

them, and the people are hungry and idle, it is proof positive of the failure in economical and political statesmanship.

This is not a thing to be cured by faith cure. It can not be cured by these big fellows in business coming out one after another with a whoopee and running around, jingling their bells, saying that conditions are all right, we are soon coming out of it.

RENEWAL OF BUYING POWER OF AGRICULTURE NECESSARY

This is not a case that can be fixed up by the medicine doctor with his whoopee, his hurrah, and his bells. The difficulty is fundamental. My friend from the Northwest, Mr. BURNES, and you gentlemen who are representing factories in this country, I say to you, revive the debt-paying and purchasing power of the farmers of the country, and, to use a figure of speech, it will be just like a rain upon the watershed. It would start the little streams going and we would begin to buy and your factories would start. Of course, this is a bad situation. I do not like to see this money being sent out here for destitute people. It is almost like the dole system, but we have bled these people until they have no reserve, they are living hand to mouth, one crop failure and they are exhausted. They are starving, we have to do an extreme thing, a dangerous thing. It is the penalty which nations must pay which sin against the laws of justice. For seventy-five or almost a hundred years you have been bleeding the producers of agricultural surpluses in order to stimulate the development of your cities, and to return to the illustration, that thing has happened which would happen with reference to a tree. If you pump away from the roots of the tree into the superstructure and keep on pumping, after awhile when a drought comes, as it has come, the top would begin to wither, the limbs would begin to die. Banks are breaking, factories are idle. You have to give to these men who dig in the ground the ability to develop a root structure that will sustain your industries when the drought comes. We are paying the penalty now.

SUPPOSE GOVERNMENT POLICY WAS REVERSED

Suppose the thing were reversed. Nothing is strange that we are used to. There were no funny or peculiar names in the community in which I grew up. You have to be outside and come into a room in order to know the atmosphere is not good. You men who have been living in cities all of these years are so accustomed to the benefits of the protective tariff that you have never considered it as a bounty, you have never considered it as a tax upon others. You have been used to it all of your lives. I am not criticizing you or fussing with you. Indeed, this proposition is too serious. You never thought of it that way before. Suppose the situation had been reversed. Suppose all of these years you had been compelled to sell in competition with the cheapest labor on earth, and out of the products of what you sold you were compelled to pay a bounty or premium to the producers of agricultural surpluses, where would you be? Nobody on earth could stand up under that. It is the biggest fool policy that this country is undertaking to operate under. The very idea that any particular part of our people engaged in necessary production can continue to do it, or that anybody could imagine that they could! I have heard the analysis made frequently on the floor of this house in regard to what the farmer has to pay because of our tariff system. It is usually recited that the farmer has to pay so much more for clothing and machinery, but that is not the picture. Look at it as it is. The farmer sells in competition with the cheapest labor on earth, and to the highest bidder. He can not possibly pass on any of his burden. I want to make that clear and then I will conclude, because you gentlemen have been very patient. Suppose a manufacturer goes into the market and buys a commodity the price of which has been increased by reason of the tariff. He writes that increase into his production cost, does he not, and passes it on to the wholesale man?

FARMERS ABSORB THE TARIFF BOOST

The wholesale man writes it into his cost of buying and passes it on to the retail man, and the retail man in turn on to the consumer. Even organized labor is frequently able,

when the cost of living goes up, by an increase in the wage scale to pass these burdens on. Doctors and lawyers pass them on, and so in America they are passed from one to the other to a very definite degree until you get to the man who raises the bushel of wheat, who has to sell that bushel of wheat in Liverpool or in the domestic market at a price fixed by the world market in competition with Argentina and all of the other countries of the world, selling it to the highest bidder. He can not pass a penny of it on, and the cotton farmer can not pass a split penny of it on. These farmers can not sell at a price which has figured into it the cost of production plus a profit. But that is not all; in the price that the farmer has to pay for tuition, for instance, who buys clothes, of course, for his girl whom he sends to school, he has to pay not only the increase in the price of her clothes, which he can not figure into his selling price, but in the tuition which he must pay, he pays a part of the increased price resulting from the tariff on the clothes that the teachers who instruct his children buy, and he can not pass it on when he comes to sell his goods, his cotton, his corn, his wheat. What is true with regard to the teacher is true generally. These farmers are at the final receiving end of this passing process. It is no wonder they are prostrate.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I have been following the gentleman very closely and I hope before he concludes his remarks he will tell us what he thinks we ought to do to remedy the situation?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I appreciate that suggestion. The Republican Party comes around asking me for advice. I tell them what to do, and they have been taking my advice for so long that I have been getting tired of it. I would not mind it if they would not use my suggestions so freely, but they use them all of the time. However, I will do it just this once more. [Laughter.] After this the good things you put into your policies you have to think up yourselves. In the first place, when we were confronted with this situation, with an assured economic paralysis coming to the farmers of the country, you ought not to have passed the last tariff bill. To be candid, I realize you can not deal with the tariff as an academic proposition now.

In America we did two very foolish things—we established slavery and we established the high protective-tariff system.

TARIFF MUST BE REDUCED

Those two serious mistakes have been tremendously fruitful of difficult problems. But we have the tariff. We can not deal with the tariff as an academic proposition. We have to deal with it now as an established institution in America, with all sorts of industries operating that have been built up behind that tariff wall conforming to the tariff wall. It is my judgment we should enter upon a policy of sane, well-considered gradual reduction. If we are going to live within America, selling nothing abroad, very well, keep it up; but if we propose to remain in world commerce, we ought to begin to let it down. We have not felt the burden of that system so much during the years that have gone by because we have had this wonderfully rich soil that we have been bleeding to maintain this policy. There is no doubt on earth about the fact that if we had not had this vast territory lying behind us and had the railroads by which we could go quickly, and the improved farm machinery, we would have reached the collapse earlier than this. That is my judgment.

I submit the proposition to you that if we continue to put up prices—the cost of everything, boost it up and boost it up—when we shall have reduced our natural resources to the level of those of our competitors, how can we do world business? I yield to anybody to answer that question. There are a few fundamental things that God Almighty fixed. I repeat, when we shall have reduced our national resources to the level of those of our competitors, how can we do world business? Nobody can ever answer that question. It just runs against some fundamental things that are wrought into the economics of things, and you can not do it.

This bleeding process of the producers of exportable surplus is at an end. But we can not tear down the whole tariff system right now, even if everybody wanted to do it. I know that. Everybody knows that. It would bring chaos to the country. We have been a long time working into this situation, and it will take a long time to work out of it, but we are at the point where we must begin.

NECESSARY TO RETURN TO AGRICULTURE WHAT TARIFF TAKES

Of course the abandonment of home manufacturing on the farm has hastened the development of this crisis.

Coming now directly to the answer of the question of my friend from Illinois [Mr. DENISON], for whom I have an affectionate regard, I will return to the figure: As long as we are pumping this vitality away from agriculture, which in a very definite sense is the root, we will have to give a vitality transfusion to agriculture. I realize that is a mixed figure, but there is much mixed thinking, and I will let it stand. The tariff is artificial and arbitrary. It is an artificial arrangement by government under which it sees to it that some people get more than they otherwise would get. It is paternalistic and arbitrary.

Gentlemen may think it is sound public policy, but they can not dispute it is an arbitrary thing. When somebody gets more for what he sells than he otherwise would have got, somebody has to pay more. When anybody gets a boost somebody has to pay for it. With us it is the producers of exportable surpluses who, finally, located at the end of the passing process, pays most of it; at least, in much larger proportions than others pay. While that artificial process is continued you will have to give an artificial blood transfusion to the patient you are bleeding. Again, I do not apologize for mixing the figure. Has anybody any other remedy than that? I can not imagine it. If you have tapped the vein and pumped out the blood and the patient is already prostrate and you are continuing to pump, I do not know of anything else to do, especially if you can not or will not stop pumping, and you can not stop pumping as long as the tariff system continues. What, then, is to be done about it?

I do not want to go into details, but I say something like the debenture has to be applied. I am not arguing it. I say it has got to be applied. Something like it has to be applied. So long as the Government arbitrarily excludes producers of exportable surpluses from its plan to protect American producers from competition with the cheap labor of the world and takes away arbitrarily from these producers of this exportable surplus a part of what they sell for in these markets, and their debt paying and buying power is paralyzed, certainly you have got to put it back where you took it from in order that they can purchase what the factories produce. If anybody has any remedy other than that, I would like to have it. You may be able to modify the method, but you have got to get that result. How are these people going to buy the products of the factories unless they get something to buy with? We have plenty of everything. It is the lack of circulation. You have heard from these farmers. They are starving. There is no reserve. How can they do it?

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I hesitate to interrupt the gentleman's excellent address, but how would the gentleman meet the situation if what we are told is true? Russia is opening up countless thousands of acres of land and coming into the market for the first time. They are opening up new land and feeding the peasants who do the work only black bread and a little poor coffee. They live and subsist on that, and eventually throw all of that wheat on the world market. How are we going to handle it?

RUSSIAN DEVELOPMENT COMPLICATES

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I agree with my friend that it tremendously complicates the situation. It makes more difficult the doing of the necessary thing but emphasizes the necessity of doing the thing. Do I make myself clear? That fact makes more difficult the doing of the necessary thing but makes the more necessary the doing of the thing.

I want to make just one observation with regard to that Russian situation. I am not afraid of military Russia. Up to this time the history of Russia has been a repetition of the history of France in the period of the French Revolution. Up to this time the same thing has happened to Russia that happened with reference to France. When France had the revolution immediately it found itself in an atmosphere of antagonism. All the nations of Europe were aligned against France. That attitude drove the French people back upon themselves in solidarity. It gave them disposition to stand punishment they otherwise could not have stood. It gave them a solidarity and the impetus that carried them not only through the period of the revolution but through the Napoleonic period, and they almost whipped the world. The same thing has happened with reference to Russia. I do not say it is good or bad, but the same thing has happened to Russia. Girded about by antagonistic attitude, that, in my judgment, gave the Bolshevik rulers an excuse for all their failures and tends to give to the Russian people the solidarity which they otherwise probably would not have had.

I think we have to look at the fact now. I am not criticizing the policy of nations. I am not discussing that. I am discussing the facts. We are sending to Russia our very best engineers. We are sending to Russia our farm implements and machinery. In other words, if we could carry the parallel from the French Revolution to this situation we would be doing the same thing that would have been done if the nations of the earth, in addition to the attitude I have indicated—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Texas five additional minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Economically speaking, we are sending to Russia our best generals and our cannon. I think we may reasonably expect that in a comparatively short length of time those cannon will be turned in our direction.

Now I yield to my friend from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. FISH. I would like to point out to the gentleman that there is a considerable difference between the parallel he has drawn with reference to the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution, inasmuch as France was never socialized like Russia, and it is from that socialization that your economic difficulties come.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The gentleman emphasizes what I said. However, France was militarized, and that is what I have been saying. France was militarized and engaged in a military conflict with the world, while Russia has been socialized and is being organized into a great economic army, moving and acting as under military control and discipline, and is entering upon that character of conflict with the world. The difference, as I have indicated, between France and Russia, is that the world is sending to Russia its best economic generals and its most effective ordnance and munition for economic war upon itself, the world.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. The point I wanted to stress was that we were coming into competition with practically slave labor. The Russian peasant is given no compensation and barely exists, so that in Russia we practically have slave labor, and we can not compete against them.

Mr. BURTNES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BURTNES. Somewhat connected with the question that was in the mind of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and the gentleman's conclusion as to the necessity of putting in new blood by some sort of transfusion—

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. You have got to do it.

Mr. BURTNES. With which I am in general accord, this question occurs to me, whether, in view of the tremendous

competition which the wheat farmer would have in the world market, in Russia and elsewhere—and I am talking of wheat simply, because of my familiarity with that problem; I do not know your cotton problem—may it not become necessary for the Government to take into consideration some method by which it can take out of production the acreage that is not now needed for our domestic consumption, so as to insure a production within the United States of an export surplus crop like wheat, with simply enough to take care of our own consumption, and in that way permit our tariff wall to operate on an equality and parity with other industries that are protected by the tariff?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It would seem to me that would be rather difficult for the Federal Government, but it might do it indirectly. However, I do believe, with regard to cotton and with regard to wheat, that possibly the States, under their general police power, in an effort to conserve the fertility of their soil could compel diversification or rotation.

There can be no question that the revival of business depends largely upon restoring the debt paying and buying power of producers of agricultural surpluses.

Mr. BURTNESS. One difficulty in our country with reference to diversification and rotation is that we find it impossible to determine the places into which to carry the substitution, and that it is more or less like jumping from the frying pan into the fire. Of course, I am thoroughly in favor of the diversification proposition, but somehow or another it seems we have too much land in production at this time, and a farmer, as long as he owns the land, is not going to allow it to remain entirely idle; he is going to try to make the best use of it possible, and, as I say, the difficulty we have had is in finding substitute crops.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I will say to my friend that if we had a condition under which the farmers in the drought-stricken areas of this country had any reserve or surplus with which to purchase food for to feed their families and animals, you would not have such an acute wheat problem; and if these cotton farmers, could have some money to buy the products of these factories there would not be so acute a problem of the idle, hungry, and poorly clothed factory people. It is my judgment the remedy for this general paralysis must be applied where the paralysis began with the producers of agricultural exportable surpluses. The process of bleeding the farmers while they bleed the soil is at an end. Both are exhausted.

Mr. BURTNESS. I think that is true to some extent.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I think that is true to a great extent. Now, I do not want to take any more of your time. I have just talked along here in a sort of random fashion, but I do believe that the sort of talk I have been trying to make, with a sort of round-table discussion, is a whole lot better way for sensible men to consider serious questions than to have some man make an oration here for an hour or so, soaring in his flights of oratory entirely away from the matter which lies right flat down here on the earth. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it has been charged now and then on the floor of the House and elsewhere that Congress has been derelict in its duty toward the service men. This is unfair, as the record conclusively shows. A survey of the legislation of every country in the world will show that no nation, ancient or modern, has done more for its service men than our country. The legislation enacted by Congress for the relief and assistance of its veterans of all wars has had the hearty approval of the people of this country.

Much of the criticism of Congress for an alleged failure to legislate for our service men has been due to the failure of those who are called upon to administer the relief legislation. A narrow construction of the laws has worked in-

justice in thousands of instances, contrary to the spirit and intent of the veterans' legislation enacted by Congress.

By legislation and by executive order we have done much to correct discrimination and injustice, but there are still sins of omission and commission on the part of Government departments that must be stopped if we are to be fair with many veterans, disabled and otherwise.

I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the case of a disabled ex-service man from my congressional district who has been endeavoring since early in the spring of 1929 to be reinstated as a guard in the Zoological Park under the Smithsonian Institution. I refer to Mr. George Weaver, whose statement of service in the Marine Corps and the Regular Army I shall submit for the RECORD:

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
Washington, January 8, 1931.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: In response to your telephonic request of this date, you are informed that George Russel Weaver, who was born January 28, 1881, at Grant, Montgomery County, Iowa, enlisted in the Marine Corps December 19, 1905, at Minneapolis, Minn., and was honorably discharged June 1, 1907, at Mare Island, Calif., upon report of medical survey for disability, a private, with character excellent. During this enlistment he served ashore in the Philippine Islands from April 22, 1906, to January 13, 1907.

With best wishes, I am, sincerely yours,

B. H. FULLER,
Major General Commandant.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, January 8, 1931.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. REED: This is in reply to your personal call at my office to-day for the military record of George Weaver, who it is stated, served in Company E, Nineteenth Infantry, and Fifty-fourth Company Coast Artillery, 1908-1911.

The official records show that George Weaver first enlisted in the United States Army January 6, 1908, at Jefferson Barracks, Mo., for three years. He was assigned to Company E, Nineteenth United States Infantry; was transferred June 30, 1910, to the Fifty-fourth Company, Coast Artillery Corps; and was honorably discharged December 21, 1910, at Fort McDowell, Calif., for the convenience of the Government, a private. Character good.

The records further show that this soldier reenlisted February 27, 1911, at Fort Logan, Colo., for three years, and that he was honorably discharged August 10, 1911, at Fort Logan, Colo., as a recruit, attached to the Nineteenth Recruit Company, United States Army, on surgeon's certificate of disability, due to dysentery, amebic chronic, incurred in line of duty in previous enlistment. Character excellent.

The records also show that this soldier served in the Philippine Islands from March 4, 1910, to November 15, 1910.

Very respectfully,

C. H. BRIDGES,
Major General, The Adjutant General.

Here we have a man whose character was above reproach throughout three enlistments in the Marine Corps and Army. You will note that he was first discharged in 1907 "for disability incurred in service in line of duty" in the Philippines. His record indicates that he is the high type of man who attempts a "come-back" time and again. He did not give up and apply for a pension; he then enlisted in the Army and served in the Philippine Islands, where his disability caused his second honorable discharge, in 1910. Nor did he apply for a pension, to which he was entitled, at that time; not until after he was honorably discharged August 10, 1911, for the third time, on surgeon's certificate of disability, incurred in line of duty in previous enlistment, character excellent. Four years after George Weaver was first discharged for disability incurred in service in line of duty he applied for and received a small pension, \$7 per month, which has since been increased to \$50 per month.

This man is not a quitter. In 1920 he passed a Civil Service examination for guard in the Zoological Park with a mark of 89.20 and, mind you, he did not claim the five points preferential rating to which he was entitled at that time. He claimed no preference as a disabled ex-service man. Under the present law that rating would be 99.20, and he would go to the top of the list. But, strictly upon his merit, his high rating placed him in the position which he

filled for 5 years, 1 month, and 13 days, until ill health again caused him to return home to Rushford, N. Y., in my Congressional District, in November, 1926.

After two years on the farm, Mr. Weaver's health improved. Fifty dollars a month was not enough to support his wife, two small children, and himself. He returned to Washington in the spring of 1929 and applied to the Smithsonian Institution for reinstatement to his old job as guard at the Zoological Park. He was going to make another "comeback." Was he met with encouragement, appreciation of his more than five years' service in the park?

From June 1 to December 31, 1929, and from January 5 to August 31, 1930, he was given temporary employment as a laborer, at \$3.50 per day, working seven days a week. The man was able to go to work again, anxious to make a decent living for his family, his wife and two small children. But instead of endeavoring to place him in his old job at the first opportunity, others, nonservice, able-bodied young men, were transferred and appointed outright to the comparatively easy employment as guard, and our disabled soldier was using the blacksmith's hammer, shoving wheelbarrows averaging 200 pounds of coal, to all of which the deep callouses on his hands give ample testimony.

I took this matter up with the Smithsonian Institution and urged that they give favorable consideration to Mr. Weaver's application, which had been pending since the spring of 1929, for reinstatement as a guard. I was informed on November 26, 1930, by Mr. C. G. Abbott, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, that—

He is quite hard of hearing and possesses other physical disability which render him unfit for the position of policeman. In the event of a rough-and-tumble encounter, as any policeman must be prepared for at all times, he would be unable to take proper care of himself.

For the information of the House, I wish to submit the medical certificate of his physical examination, which was performed by the United States Public Health Service on July 28, 1930:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—CERTIFICATE OF MEDICAL EXAMINATION UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER JUNE 18, 1923

(Applicant must fill in dotted lines below)

George R. Weaver, 636 Newton Place NW.; sex, male; date of birth, January 28, 1882.

What examination did you take? Mechanic. In what department and bureau are you to be employed? Zoo Park. In what city or town are you to be employed? District of Columbia.

Physician should fill in the following: Height, without shoes, 69 inches; weight, in clothing, 136½ pounds. Weight, without clothing, _____ pounds. Males, without clothing; females, clothed but without wrap or hat.

Items checked (✓) were examined and found normal. Deviations from normal are noted. (See instructions on back of sheet.)

1. Eyes: For distance; with glasses if worn: Right 20; left 20. Without glasses: Right 20/30; left 20/30. Evidence of disease or injury: Right _____ Left _____

2. Ears: Is conversational voice heard at 20 feet?
Right, 20 feet.
Left, 20 feet.

3. Nose: _____

4. Mouth: _____

5. Throat: _____

6. Thyroid (especially in women) _____

7. Heart _____

8. Lungs: _____

Right _____

Left _____

9. Inguinal rings (men only):

Right _____

Left _____

(Any hernia should be noted, inguinal, ventral, femoral, etc.)

10. Varicose veins _____

(If "Yes," state location and degree)

11. Flat foot _____

(If "Yes," state extent of impairment of function)

12. Deformities, atrophies, and other abnormalities, diseases, or defects not included above _____

13. Scars of serious injury or disease: Appendectomy _____

14. Urinalysis (see over) _____

15. Has applicant ever received pension, compensation, or training because of disability received while in military or naval service? Yes. If "Yes," describe disability and state whether present now: Dysentery (not present now) hard fecal masses.

¹ For males, to be taken only upon special written request of the official ordering examination.

16. Considering your findings in this examination, as well as the history and the duties of the position of under mechanic, what is the ability of the applicant to perform the duties? Physically qualified.

Place of examination: U. S. P. H. S. Relief Station, Room 323, Post Office Department, Twelfth and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.

Date of examination: July 28, 1930.

The examining physician must be in the Federal service.

(Name of examining physician)

Acting Assistant Surgeon, United States Public Health Service.

(Title, and branch of medical service)

This report is to be returned to the official of the United States Civil Service Commission requesting the examination.

The aim of the Executive order of June 18, 1923, and of this examination thereunder is to obtain information as to the physical condition of appointees to the classified civil service with a view to promoting efficiency and minimizing accidents and claims under United States employees' compensation laws.

NOTES FOR EXAMINING PHYSICIAN

Weight: Males, without clothing, and also in ordinary clothing without overcoat or hat (weigh twice); females, clothed but without wrap or hat.

Height: Without boots or shoes; observe that no appliances are used to increase.

The examination should include the following observations, as to—

(1) Eyes: Ptosis; discharge; corneal scars; pterygium. In recording vision consider 20 feet as normal and report all vision as a fraction with 20 feet as numerator and the smallest type read at 20 feet as denominator. If glasses are used, record for each eye the finding with and without glasses.

(2) Ears: Evidence of middle ear or mastoid disease; condition of drums; discharge. In recording hearing, record 20 feet as normal distance for conversational voice and record deviation from normal as fraction with 20 as denominator and actual distance as numerator.

(3) Nose: Ability to blow through each nostril. If free, a speculum examination would not be indicated.

(4) Throat: Tonsils; hypertrophy.

(5) Mouth: Missing teeth; pyorrhea.

(6) Thyroid: Presence of tumor in neck and tremor; exophthalmos; nervous high-strung disposition; especially in women.

(7) Heart: Murmurs. If valvular disease exists, state whether or not it is fully compensated.

(8) Lungs: It is necessary that the auscultatory cough be used. Tuberculosis; if present, state whether active or arrested, and if arrested your opinion as to how long it has been quiescent. Sputum to be examined for tubercle bacilli in all suspected cases.

(9) Inguinal rings: Hernia; no hernia but impulse on coughing; no hernia or impulse but abnormally large rings. Any other hernia should be noted, and if present describe fully and state whether it is retained by well-fitting truss.

(10 to 13) Scars, deformities, atrophies, paralyses, or flat foot of such a nature as to incapacitate or become aggravated by work or be later alleged as caused by accident or occupation. By "flat foot," as used in this form, is meant a foot with impaired function, the term being equivalent to "fallen or misplaced arch," an abnormal condition. Impairment of function is the point to be noted. It is not intended that small, insignificant blemishes which might be referred to as marks of identification be recorded.

(14) Urinalysis to be made and blood pressure to be taken when especially indicated, particularly in persons over 40 when arteriosclerosis, nephritis, or diabetes is suspected.

Record, if taken: Urinalysis: Sp. gr. _____ Albumen _____ Sugar _____

Blood pressure: Mm. Hg. systolic _____ Mm. Hg. diastolic _____

REMARKS _____

(Name of examining physician)

(Title, and branch of medical service)

Examined for position in—

Department _____

Bureau _____

Title of position _____

Number of certificate upon which applicant's name appears _____

Contrary to the advice of Mr. Abbott that "he is quite hard of hearing," you will note the medical certificate reports his hearing as perfect—"20-20." His eyesight is reported as "20-30," and evidence of his disability incurred in service in line of duty "not present now."

The Civil Service Commission considers Mr. Weaver eligible for reinstatement as guard and, in fact, has so advised the Agricultural Department, where I have made another vain attempt to place him.

Upon my request, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution has furnished me with the following list of guards now employed at the National Zoological Park, and their military records:

MILITARY SERVICE RECORD OF POLICE, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

Richard Sebastian, sergeant, age 48 years. Appointed National Zoological Park July 1, 1916. No service.

Noble S. Cook, age 74 years. Appointed National Zoological Park December 1, 1888. No service.

Arthur L. Edwards, age 60 years. Appointed National Zoological Park November 1, 1890. No service.

John H. Ashby, age 40 years. Appointed National Zoological Park August 3, 1918. No service.

Robert E. Ewell, age 33 years. Appointed National Zoological Park April 28, 1913. Furloughed for military duty July 19, 1916. Returned from military duty November 8, 1916. Furloughed for military duty March 31, 1917. Returned from military duty April 21, 1919.

Ladislaus A. Tabinski, age 54 years. Appointed National Zoological Park, April 17, 1925. Enlisted October 3, 1907. Discharged October 2, 1910.

Charles B. Gooding, age 48 years. Appointed National Zoological Park November 1, 1920. No service. (Appointed policeman April 1, 1930.)

James M. Watson, age 45 years. Appointed National Zoological Park, December 10, 1918. Transferred to Post Office June 30, 1921. Transferred from Veterans' Bureau December 22, 1926. No service.

William R. James, age 31 years. Appointed National Zoological Park, July 12, 1922. Enlisted September 5, 1916. Discharged July 31, 1920.

Charles F. Loyd, age 34 years. Appointed National Zoological Park, October 1, 1930. Enlisted May 30, 1918. Discharged December 20, 1918.

Joseph C. Keene, age 29 years. Appointed National Zoological Park, March 1, 1919. No service (entered on duty as policeman December 1, 1930.)

John H. Mills, age 36 years. Appointed National Zoological Park, December 16, 1927. Enlisted September 30, 1918. Discharged December 5, 1918. (Entered on duty as policeman December 1, 1930.)

George D. McLeod, age 29 years. Appointed National Zoological Park, September 1, 1928. No service. (Appointed policeman effective January 1, 1931.)

Eight out of 11 have no service. One served 2 months, 5 days. One served 7 months.

I am submitting for the record a copy of my reply to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution:

DECEMBER 29, 1930.

C. G. ABBOTT,

Secretary Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ABBOTT: I regret that the pressure of business here has delayed this acknowledgment of your letter of November 26 with reference to Mr. George R. Weaver, an employee of the National Zoological Park.

I am very much interested in this statement contained in the third paragraph of your letter to the effect that "in the event of a rough-and-tumble encounter as any policeman must be prepared for at all times he would be unable to take proper care of himself."

I agree with you that Mr. Weaver is not in excellent physical condition which is verified by the fact that he receives a pension for disability incurred in line of duty as a soldier. I understand that his duties consist of handling eight or nine wheelbarrows of coal each day, averaging 200 pounds, also assisting the blacksmith, which seems rather heavy duty for a war veteran who would not be able to take care of himself in a rough-and-tumble encounter.

A number of us here in Congress feel that the departments treat our disabled veterans disgraceful where they have the slightest discretion in appointments, and when I look over the list inclosed with your letter I am very sure that you have not exerted the least effort to give Mr. Weaver the consideration to which he is entitled.

I shall endeavor to find another Government position for him. In the meantime, I expect that his duties will be made as difficult as possible.

Yours very truly,

DANIEL A. REED.

In glancing over the lists of guards, I notice that one of them is 74 years old; another who has, unfortunately, lost the sight of one eye, is 60 years old. While these men have been in the Government service for a long time and should by all means be cared for, it is my belief that they should be assigned to positions where they would not be subjected to "rough-and-tumble encounters."

I further seems to me that Mr. John Ashby, age 40 years; Mr. Charles B. Goodings, age 48; Mr. James M. Watson, age 45; Mr. Joseph C. Keene, age 29; or Mr. George D. McLeod, age 29, no one of whom has seen military service, might be assigned to a more difficult task and make way for Mr. Weaver.

The least that could have been done for this disabled veteran would have been to have given him preferential consideration over the following men, none of whom have seen

military service and all of whom have been appointed to positions as guards since Mr. Weaver applied for reinstatement:

Mr. Gooding, appointed April 1, 1930.

Mr. Keene, transferred to police force December 1, 1930.

Mr. McLeod, transferred to police force January 1, 1931.

Mr. Mills, age 36, who served from September 30 to December 5, 1918, in military service, was transferred to the police force effective December 1, 1930, and Mr. Lloyd, age 34, who served from May 30 to December 20, 1918, in military service, was appointed as a guard on October 1, 1930.

In view of the fact that Mr. Weaver has been put aside while these nonservice men have been appointed, it might occur to you that there might be some foundation for the statement of the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution that he is unfitted for the position of guard, but in this regard I call your attention not only to the medical examination made by the Public Health Service but to the fact that the Civil Service Commission will certify him for a position as guard upon the request of any department of the Government. But, as in all reinstatements, the appointment official of the department must request the Civil Service Commission to certify his name. This leaves all reinstatements in the hands of the Government departments.

As you know, when a man has resigned from a Government position he is never again placed on the eligible list and certified to the departments for a position. If he should apply to the Civil Service Commission, he would be advised that he must find a vacancy and have the department request his reinstatement.

This leaves the fate of our veterans, or anyone seeking reinstatement, entirely in the hands of the appointment officials in the various departments. You will at once realize what an impossible thing it is for a man to make the rounds to all of the appointment clerks of all the departments and find a job. If you have ever known a Government department to volunteer the information that a vacancy existed, you have been more fortunate than I have.

What is the answer? From my experience and the experience of a number of Members with whom I have talked, we can not expect to change the attitude of these appointment officials in the departments toward our disabled veterans. It may be that a reemployment register, such as we had immediately following the war in the Civil Service Commission, would solve the problem if our veterans, disabled and able-bodied, who are seeking reinstatement, were, upon application, placed upon a register of eligibles and certified to the departments in the same manner as those who are seeking their first appointment.

We must not permit our disabled ex-service men to be met with a cold reception and discouragement when they are making every effort to reestablish themselves.

The question of reinstatement no doubt affects our disabled veterans more than any other class of Government employees, and logically so, because these men, in trying to win their way back into steady employment, often find that their impaired health compels them to give up their work for a while and subsist on the compensation which we have provided. Then, after a period of rest, they are again ready and anxious to take up their work and endeavor to carry on. This is where the discretionary power of the Government departments enters very vitally into their lives, as in the case of Mr. Weaver.

As you know, President Hoover has recently named the following advisory committee to carry on the study authorized by Executive order of June 9, 1928:

Hon. Thomas B. Campbell, chairman, president Civil Service Commission.

Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Hon. Royal Johnson, of South Dakota.

Hon. Seth Richardson, Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. John Thomas Taylor, American Legion.

I understand that this committee has held two preliminary meetings, one just before Christmas, for the purpose of organization, and the other on January 6, 1931.

The purpose of the committee is set forth in the following Executive order of June 9, 1928:

EXECUTIVE ORDER OF JUNE 9, 1928

There is hereby created an advisory committee whose duty will be to study, analyze, and report upon the civil-service rules relating to the veterans' preference. Its main purpose will be to ascertain ways and means for making Government positions available for the disabled veterans.

The committee is empowered to make a survey of the positions available in the executive branch of the Federal Government and to draft recommendations to be submitted to the President not later than December 1, 1928. The report of the committee should include advice as to what modification, if any, should be made in the present Executive order relating to such veterans' preference.

I hereby appoint as such advisory committee Hon. HAMILTON FISH, Jr., Member of the House of Representatives, chairman; Hon. William T. Deming, president Civil Service Commission; Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Director Veterans' Bureau; Col. William J. Donovan, Assistant Attorney General; and Lieut. Col. John Thomas Taylor.

The respective members of the committee are empowered to designate alternates to act for them whenever necessary.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 9, 1928.

I have every confidence that the members of the committee are most sympathetic toward our veterans, and I hope they may devise a plan such as the reemployment register which I have suggested, or some other method to insure the reinstatement of ex-service men.

This is not my first experience with the Government departments and bureaus where the employment of disabled veterans were concerned. Another recent case was that of a World War veteran who lost one leg overseas, a fine young man, a college graduate. This young man, after having been refused employment by a number of business concerns because of his greater liability to accident and, therefore, more of a risk on account of the State compensation laws, came to Washington. The Civil Service Commission, I wish to state, has shown him every possible courtesy and kindness within its power. Through the cooperation of Hon. George R. Wales, of that commission, a temporary appointment was arranged in the Census Bureau pending an examination.

It was, however, like drawing teeth in the Census Bureau to get them to request short extensions of the temporary appointment until an examination was called. He was discharged before he could qualify for regular appointment. He is now on the civil-service eligible list, at the top of the register for student finger-print classifier, which will enable him to be certified to any general clerical position, but preferably the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice. The employment clerk of that bureau can find no place for him, nor does there seem to be any need for an additional clerk in any of the departments, except one temporary position in the Veterans' Bureau for a period of 88 days. Before that time has elapsed I hope the President's advisory committee on veterans' preference will have devised ways of carrying out "its main purpose," which is "to ascertain ways and means for making Government positions available for the disabled veterans."

Many Members of this House with whom I have talked have had experiences with the Government departments similar to these. It is my intention to call these cases to the attention of the President's Advisory Committee on Veterans' Preference, and my purpose in bringing these matters before the House is to suggest that those of you who have had like experiences do the same.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON].

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, in the debate on the amendment to the War Department appropriation bill, proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], reference was made to Norwich University, located at Northfield, Vt., as a strictly military institution. Inasmuch as the value of such training in schools and colleges was under challenge, it may not be inappropriate before we get too far away from the subject to draw a lesson from the experience of that institution, one of the foremost colleges of its class in the country. In fact, many authorities give it rank next to West Point in the efficiency of instruction, and because it has contributed so

much to the upbuilding of the Nation and to its defense at critical periods of our history.

Norwich University was founded in 1819 by Capt. Alden Partridge, who for 12 years was connected with West Point as a professor of mathematics and civil engineering and as superintendent for two years. He was an early advocate of the policy of establishing military schools similar to West Point, with doors open to the young men of the whole country for an education that would fit them to command in times of need and for faithful service to their country.

Captain Partridge was a man of broad vision. As early as 1818 he set forth views that the best means of national defense lay in preparation in times of peace. He saw that the chief reliance of national defense was in the great body of the American people organized into suitable military establishments, officered by men of the right capacity, scientific education, and military training. He set out to supply certain deficiencies in the educational training of American colleges. He believed that education in its perfect form should prepare our youth in the best possible manner for the correct discharge of duties in any station of life.

Following out his plan he was instrumental in the establishment of a military school at Portsmouth, Va., which was sponsored by the legislature of that State. This school, with a similar one at Lexington, Va., served as types for the establishment of many other institutions of a similar kind throughout the Southern States. At a later period of his life he established a school at Brandywine Springs near Wilmington, Del., and another at Bristol, Pa. Through these activities he came to be regarded as the father of the idea of military instruction in schools and colleges.

He took still another advanced step in the development of the American idea of national defense. In 1842 he called together at Reading, Pa., a group of officers and men of the volunteer militia of that State and proceeded to instruct them in the manual of arms and in company, regimental, and brigade movements during the day, and to further instruct them through the conduct of lecture courses at night. He was the originator of the idea of citizens' military training camps and reserve officers' training. His work in this connection had much to do with bringing the militia of the States into a uniform system that would give respectability and efficiency to that department of the public service.

In addition to these activities he was the moving spirit in calling a convention of military officers and persons interested in giving greater efficiency in the organization of militia of the several States. These conventions were continued for several years for the discussion of plans of organization. The proceedings were printed by order of Congress and formed the basis for the development of our National Guard system.

Norwich University, guided by the spirit of its founder, has directed its training along lines laid down by him. We may well consider the experience of 100 years and draw from it lessons to guide us in dealing with the question of military training in schools and colleges.

The institution has given to the Nation men who have been leaders in thought and action, not alone in war but in times of peace, in our great commercial development and in advancing the material welfare of the country.

In time of war, up to the World War, her sons to the number of nearly 500 served as officers with the troops of 33 of our States and Territories. In this list appear the names of 7 major generals, 8 brigadier generals, 1 surgeon general, 39 colonels, 34 lieutenant colonels, 24 majors, 155 captains, 1 admiral, 3 rear admirals, 6 commodores, and 3 captains of the Navy.

Norwich furnished 770 men for the World War. Eighty-six per cent of the graduates held commissions. Sixty-two per cent of these ranked above second lieutenants. Is there any other college in the country that can show a better record?

I will allude to only two outstanding military leaders who attended Norwich. President Truman B. Ransom resigned during the Mexican War to take command of the Ninth United States Infantry. He led that regiment in a gallant

charge up the heights of Chapultepec, but was mortally wounded at the moment of victory. His bravery in leadership was the deciding factor in the capture of that fortress. The other is Admiral George Dewey who, when he gave the command at Manila to Gridley to commence firing, opened the gates of the Orient to the civilizing and helpful influence of America. There are hundreds of others who received inspiration for military service from contact with the institution, and who have served their country with distinction and honor. Let us turn to its helpful influence in times of peace.

The graduates of Norwich have been the builders. In this class may I call your attention to Asa Howe the great railroad construction engineer of the Northeast and in the Central West; William H. Greenwood, builder of the Kansas Pacific railroad to Denver, the Pueblo & Arkansas, and chief engineer of the Mexican National; George H. Elliot, builder of the Aqueduct system of the National Capital; Alonzo F. Estabrook the railroad builder of the early days of Indiana; Marcus Robinson, who made such a record as a builder in Virginia that he was offered the position of chief engineer for the building of all the railroads for the Russian Empire; Gen. Grenville M. Dodge, one time a Member of Congress, who laid the bands of steel over the prairies, up over the Rocky Mountains and down into the valleys of the Pacific coast and gave us the Union Pacific system; Edwin McNeill, construction engineer of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western; Newell Gleason, builder of the Pittsburgh, Fort Wayne & Chicago. There are hundreds of others who could be added to this roll. In fact I have a list of over 200 railroads in the building of which Norwich men had an important part.

Norwich men have been leaders in the political field. In the list of these we find Gov. Ryland Fletcher of Vermont; Jefferson P. Kidder, one time judge of the United States Court for the then Territory of Dakota; Calvin Lyon, Governor of the Territory of Idaho in the early days; Gilman Folson, for years one of the leading lawyers of the State of Iowa; Judge Burleigh Spaulding, of the Supreme Court of North Dakota; Gideon Welles, Secretary of the Navy in the Cabinet of President Lincoln; the distinguished lawyer of North Carolina, whose name escapes me for the moment but who was attorney general of the Confederacy in the cabinet of Jefferson Davis; Horatio Seymour, twice Governor of the Empire State and the Democratic candidate for President in 1868; John Phillips, Member of Congress from Alabama; Isaac S. Morse, Member of Congress from Louisiana and later in the Diplomatic Service; Luther S. Dixon, of Wisconsin, distinguished lawyer and judge; William P. Kellogg, one time chief justice of the Supreme Court of Nebraska, later United States Senator from Louisiana, governor, again United States Senator, and later a Member of the House of Representatives.

Norwich graduates have laid foundations for great enterprises in their day and generation. In that class we have Junius Spencer Morgan, founder of the house of Morgan in New York City, London, and Paris; James H. Ward, who conceived the idea of the establishment of the Naval Academy and one of its first instructors; Charles E. Tilton, head of a great banking concern in Oregon and organizer of the development of the Northwest; Edward Dean Adams, of New York City, business organizer and financier, chairman of the committee that reorganized the Northern Pacific Railroad, reorganizer of the West Shore & Buffalo, the Central Railroad of New Jersey, and many other great corporations, and one of the leading civil engineers of the world; Alvan Earl Bovay, the founder of the Republican Party at Ripon, Wis.

These are a few of the men Norwich has given to the world for lives of usefulness to their fellowmen, through military training combined with scientific academic work. The list is woefully incomplete, since I have included only names that occur to me without access to the records.

It is the consensus of opinion of educators that the success of Norwich men is due to the splendid qualities of leadership acquired through military training. This is the lesson the

institution gives to the Nation. It has met the demands of the day that educational institutions turn out graduates qualified for leadership in national development. I can say without fear of contradiction that Norwich has contributed more successful men than any other institution, taking into consideration the numbers of graduates.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SWICK] made inquiry of me during the progress of the debate of Thursday if Norwich had any trouble in enrolling students. The truth is we refuse admission to scores each year owing to lack of accommodations. The demand for the kind of an education Norwich offers has become so great that we are now seeking to raise \$1,500,000 with which to increase our facilities. This effort is proceeding to success under the able leadership of its president, Col. Charles A. Plumley, the son of a former distinguished Member of this House and one of my predecessors.

One of the enemies of our country to-day is the professional pacifist. He bores from within, and, given time without check, he will weaken the noble structure built by our forbears. Against all attacks on our country, its Constitution, and its institutions Norwich University and Norwich men stand as the staunchest of defenders. That has been its policy for a hundred years. We pledge the same steadfastness and loyalty for the years of the future.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I propose to revert to the subject concerning which I made some remarks on Tuesday last, namely, the foreign and domestic trade of the United States.

During the past few days the press of the country has given extensive publicity to the report made by one of our prominent international bankers to his board of directors. I think it will be found that the general reaction to the proposals made by this gentleman is divided into two classes. Theorists and internationalists and probably political economists will doubtless agree with the suggestions and contend that they offer some opportunities for readjustments and improvements in business conditions. On the other hand, the practical business men and Government officials who do not regard successful foreign investments as being of the first importance will take material exception and directly oppose the suggestions offered.

Quite likely I would not again enter into a discussion of this subject were it not for a somewhat unprecedented incident which occurred when I spoke a few days ago. At the close of my brief remarks I asked permission to extend the same by including a brief statement made on the subject by Assistant Secretary of Commerce Julius Klein, who not only is recognized as a world-trade expert but who is one of the high officials of our Government. While it was, of course, within the rights of the Member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], to interpose an objection, I consider that it was disrespectful to Doctor Klein and particularly to the office he holds.

In order that the remarks which I asked permission to insert may become a part of the RECORD I propose to read them at this time.

In a statement by Doctor Klein he said:

Speaking of export trade obstacles, we hear much these days from job-hunting demagogues and headline hungry publicists of the devastation to be visited upon trade by way of retaliatory tariff discriminations.

Doubtless there will be a few bona fide instances of this, but such problems are far from being a novelty in our commercial development.

Our traders have long been accustomed to encounter discriminatory devices in world markets everywhere, applied because of our war-debt policy, or our immigration policy, or our tariff policy, or any other handy alibi.

But in time these difficulties, no matter what their alleged cause, have been overcome. And the usual arbiter of their fate has been the determined foreign consumer, insisting upon the availability of American films or tractors or other wares which seem to meet his needs so completely.

In fact, consumers everywhere in these days of "the buyers' market" are pretty apt to have the last word.

For one thing, there are a good many more of them than there are of rival traders or ambitious politicians, and they are con-

siderably better placed than they ever before were to assert their wants and to see that something is done about it.

The special merits of American merchandise are thoroughly understood by buyers in every remote corner of the globe, thanks to our films, our advertising technique, the world-wide spread of our illustrated periodicals, and the universal growth of our branch factories.

Last month, following a two months' visit abroad, Doctor Klein made a radio address in which, among other things, he said:

In Europe and the Near East the alleged foreign enmity toward this country and its business efforts is largely mythical right now—a figment of superheated imaginations.

To be sure, you can find some local irritation or envy in certain spots, but any general, organized animosity or malevolence toward American commerce or the American people is virtually non-existent.

Here is a striking fact: In only one European country can bitterness against us on account of the tariff be said to prevail to-day with any real strength, and that is a country of distinctly minor importance in world economics, only 3 per cent of whose exports were adversely affected by our new tariff act.

In by far the greater number of European and eastern Mediterranean countries ill-feeling toward the United States is conspicuous by its absence.

And in one great region to which we give too little thought, the Balkans and the Near East, there is a genuine, deep regard for this country, a hearty friendliness that has arisen from a variety of causes, especially because of our obvious and utter lack of imperialistic motives in those quarters, in contrast with the aspirations of some of the great European powers.

That is the firm impression I got en route through the Balkans and the Near East, talking with men in most of the walks of life—economists, industrialists, labor leaders, financiers, statesmen, presidents, kings.

Let me now briefly return to the principal suggestions offered in the report of the chairman of the board to which I have just referred, namely, reduction in wages, reduction of duties, and reduction of foreign debts.

The wage feature has been very fully answered by representatives of the American Federation of Labor. I quote first from President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, who, while in attendance upon the midwinter session of the federation at Miami, Fla., made the following comment:

Mr. Wiggin is illogical and at odds with our leading economists, also many of our great employers, in his advocacy of lower wages.

If, with our present production, we lower wages and thus decrease the buying power of consumers throughout the Nation, this depression may continue indefinitely. Having the materials and the production machinery, we can only restore normal business conditions by placing the Nation's buying power on a par with production.

Mr. Hugh Frayne, New York representative of the American Federation of Labor, made this statement:

I regret very much that Mr. Wiggin, head of the largest bank in the world, should say that wage reductions will help our unemployment situation. His statement in this regard will have not only a depressing effect generally but it will encourage those who may be inclined to reduce wages and limit their forces. Lower wages will lower consumption. Let him increase the pay of his employees and he will at once see that their consumption will increase. Wage reductions never created better times. If low wages will bring prosperity, China would be at the top and not at the bottom of the prosperity group.

Low wages mean dissatisfied workers, strife and trouble, and a lowering of the consumption of commodities. We want greater consumption of commodities, and the way to get that is to maintain prevailing wages and to raise wages.

Benjamin Schlesinger, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, said:

Wage reductions would not result in lowering commodity prices. They would only benefit some selfish employing interests and would at the same time further break down the purchasing ability of millions of workers all over the United States.

The average annual wage of American workers being what they are, about \$1,250, we consider Mr. Wiggin's advice to labor to help bring about prosperity through wage reductions neither logical nor helpful. It is characteristic that not one of the big employers of labor in the United States has as yet come forward with such a suggestion.

With regard to the tariff, this has been so fully discussed, pro and con, that there is very little need of extended argument. The inference is drawn in the report that owing to the increased rates in the 1930 tariff act our foreign trade has been materially reduced. Official statistics do not bear out this claim.

During the period in which the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922 was in force the value of our exports increased from \$4,167,000,000 to \$5,240,000,000, and the value of our imports increased from \$3,792,000,000 to \$4,399,000,000. In other words, in spite of the tariff increases provided in the act of 1922, our business with foreign countries showed a steady, healthy increase during the years that followed.

The present world-wide depression began several months before the tariff act of 1930 became law. It therefore can not be held that the rates contained therein are a factor in the present condition. While foreign trade has diminished in volume during the present depression, official statistics show that the United States has retained its percentage of trade with the countries of the world.

I stated in my previous remarks that the critics of the tariff dealt in generalities and did not specify particular items. While in theory it would appear that increased rates of duty should be followed by increased costs to consumers, this frequently does not work out in practice. No better illustration can be found than the case of sugar, the duty on which was increased by the 1930 tariff law. I admit I was one of the opponents of this increase. During the preparation of the bill figures were presented purporting to show the increased cost to the American home which an increase in the sugar duty would entail. It is true that figures do not lie, but sometimes they are susceptible to serious mistakes. The retail price of sugar a year ago was 6.6 cents a pound. In November last it was 5.8 cents. This is the average retail price throughout the United States, as furnished by the Department of Commerce. This decrease in price has occurred in spite of the added duty on sugar. It is much safer to say that prices follow supply and demand and competitive conditions than to say that they follow tariff rates.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; for a brief question.

Mr. SLOAN. I would like to ask the gentleman, who is a member of the Ways and Means Committee, if he knows of a single instance where the adverse prophecies relative to the effect of the new tariff bill have been carried out or realized?

Mr. TREADWAY. I think the gentleman should, perhaps, ask that question of some one who was not favorable to the tariff bill when it was passed. I was strongly in favor of it and I know the way it has worked out since then has been extremely advantageous if normal conditions existed in this country to-day.

Mr. SLOAN. And the gentleman knows of no adverse prophecy that has been carried out?

Mr. TREADWAY. I know of no such instance and I do not think one exists.

In reference to the proposed reduction of war debts, this subject was gone into thoroughly by the American Debt Settlement Commission in consultation with the representatives of the countries whose obligations we hold. The one rule which our representatives adhered to above all others was ability to pay. In following this rule settlements were fixed on such a basis as would not cause any nation undue hardship in meeting its obligation to this country.

It may be that certain bankers interested in foreign securities are justified in finding fault with the settlements arrived at by the Foreign Debt Settlement Commission on practically all loans made by this country during and following the war. On the other hand, each one of these settlements was adopted on the floor of this House and the action of the commission was supported here.

The explanations which were presented on the floor were certainly convincing, and no man contributed more to the final result than our able colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP]. I have been intimately associated with him for years on the Ways and Means Committee, and those of us who have been fortunate enough to meet with him around the committee table have the same high opinion of his ability and his conscientious public service as have the Members of this House, regardless of their party affiliations.

So I say that when Judge CRISP, with his abundant knowledge of all the details of the debt settlements, tells us, as he did in his speeches, that we were dealing fairly and justly with our former allies, I for one prefer to accept his findings than those of a banker whose suggestions are naturally biased by his business interests.

Let me quote a very recent contribution by one of the keenest thinkers in this country, Calvin Coolidge, regarding our foreign trade and our living conditions. He says:

The better the trade of the (British) empire the better will be our trade. Over two-fifths of our exports go to the British Empire. Canada is our largest customer, with the British Isles a close second. We want them all prosperous. To maintain our living standards we have and shall retain some advantage in our home markets under the tariff, but imports of about \$3,000,000,000, free from duties, make us the second largest free market in the world. No nation can do all the export trade on earth. Unless it is properly distributed, it diminishes. We can take our chances with all other exporters and wish them well.

In conclusion, it seems to me that in view of the eminent authorities I have quoted on all three of the suggestions of the chairman of the board of the Chase National Bank, he fails to make his case in any one of them, and the American people to-day anticipate a speedy restoration of normal business conditions, both in our domestic markets and in our foreign markets, without resorting to reduction of wages, reduction of the tariff, or reduction of the debts owed us by foreign countries. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Does the gentleman feel that the tariff bill to which he has referred at length is better supported by assertions rather than by existing facts?

Mr. TREADWAY. Of course, the latter we will all admit.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Does the gentleman think he can demonstrate the wisdom of the tariff by existing conditions?

Mr. TREADWAY. I certainly think so, provided one gives due allowance for world-wide conditions, over which neither the tariff nor any other single thing in this country can control. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, when the conference report carrying appropriations for the year 1931 was before the House at the last session I made a speech in which attention was called to the tentative allocation by the State Department of funds carried in the bill for rent, fuel, and light.

Mr. BYRNS, of Tennessee, made a speech on the same subject; and Mr. BYRNS and I both made reference also to the item inserted by the Senate under the head of "Representation allowances."

It was very pleasing to find that the State Department later made an entirely different allocation from that which we called attention to, and which was in conformity to a limitation referred to in my speech as expressive of the wish of the House conferees.

Since it is my purpose to refer to these matters when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule, I now ask unanimous consent to insert my speech made on the conference report, and also to insert, as a part of my remarks, the order of the President relating to representation allowances and the allocation made during 1931 of such allowances as well as the proposed allocation of such allowances for the fiscal year 1932.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The papers to be inserted follow:

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we will find, when Congress meets in December to consider another bill for the Department of State, that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] has rendered a distinct service to the country in calling attention to this item. I concur in the views expressed by him as to this item. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] asked what explanation had been offered as to why, for the first time, this item had been approved by the President. The only real explanation that I have heard at any time was a suggestion by some one that the Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson, took it up with the President while they were in Virginia on a recreational visit, and after the

matter was fully discussed the President gave his approval thereto. The House Appropriations Committee was so little impressed with this item that they disallowed it; and when the chairman of the committee was discussing this bill before the House some one inquired of him about this item, and he stated the committee had disallowed it, and the House passed the bill without anyone insisting on the inclusion of the item. The Senate inserted it, and I regret that a majority of the conferees favored its retention. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CLARKE] made a very important observation in connection with the remarks made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], and those matters were adverted to by members of our committee and were partly responsible for our committee's refusal to recommend the same to the House.

Before the House disposes of the conference report on this bill carrying appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, I deem it important that some facts in reference to other items now fresh in the minds of the members of the committee be written into the record. I venture to predict that these facts will present the basis for an interesting study by the next Congress, and I am hopeful it may restrain the State Department from making an unreasonable and unwise expenditure of public funds.

The Budget estimate submitted this year to the Committee on Appropriations for the Department of State carried for the first time estimates for rent, heat, fuel, and light, and what is commonly called "representation allowances" for its Foreign Service officers. The committee disapproved the Budget recommendation for representation allowances, amounting to \$92,000, and also reduced the Budget estimate for rent, heat, fuel, and light \$100,000. The House approved the action of the committee as to these matters.

An item of \$200,000 to provide heat, light, and fuel for the Foreign Service in the Department of Commerce was stricken out on a point of order by the House.

The Senate restored the \$92,000 for representation allowances to the State Department and also increased for the State Department the amount carried for rent, fuel, and light by \$100,000, which was the amount the House deducted from the Budget estimate. The Senate also carried \$200,000 for the Foreign Service in the Department of Commerce, and this appropriation was inserted in the bill on a supplemental estimate submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the President, before any legislation was passed either in the House or Senate authorizing the same. Before this bill was taken up in conference, the bill reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce authorizing rent, fuel, and light allowances for the Foreign Service in the Department of Commerce had been approved by the President, thus making such item in order when the conferees met. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] understands why I call attention to the Budget estimate being sent to the Senate before there was legal authority therefor.

I wish to here submit a letter from Hon. W. L. Cooper, Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, showing that \$200,000 will care for the needs of the Foreign Service and further showing a reasonable and prudent allocation of such funds for the purposes appropriated.

The letter follows:

Hon. MILTON W. SHREVE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I understand that a question has arisen with reference to the proposed distribution of the appropriation of \$200,000 which we have requested in order to provide for quarters for our men abroad. The following is an estimate of the requirements of our men abroad under present conditions:

| Class | Number of men | Annual rate (maximum) | Annual amount |
|------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| I..... | 8 | \$1,800 | \$14,400 |
| II..... | 29 | 1,500 | 43,500 |
| III..... | 76 | 1,200 | 91,200 |
| IV..... | 54 | 900 | 48,600 |
| V..... | 22 | 600 | 13,200 |
| Total..... | | | 210,900 |

It is anticipated, however, that, on account of our foreign field men who are now assigned to duty in the United States, and because of men returning home on leave, the required amount will be well below the \$200,000 limit. The above list also includes our field officers who are stationed in the Philippines and Porto Rico, who will not be eligible for quarters' allowance because it was decided that the regulations would apply only to those in foreign countries.

Trusting that this will give you the desired information, I am,
Yours very truly,

W. L. COOPER, Director.

This letter shows that the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, of which Mr. Cooper is the director, appears to have made a very reasonable allocation of the \$200,000 provided for rent, heat, and light for foreign officials serving under the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and such an allocation as Mr. Cooper suggests in his letter can well be approved.

I felt that it was important that the House have this information, since it was this letter by Mr. Cooper that led the House conferees on this bill to make further inquiry of the State Department as to its allocation of funds carried in the bill for rent, heat, and light for its Foreign Service, and which amount the Senate had increased by \$100,000. In conference with a representative of the State Department the committee felt that the tentative allocation of this fund was not reasonable, prudent, or fair, and the House conferees then concluded to place a limitation on the amount carried in the Senate bill, so that the State Department could not allocate to its officials what, in the judgment of the House conferees, would have been unreasonable sums.

The Senate conferees were unwilling to consider any limitation, and announced they would not insist on the language inserted by the Senate and would concur in the action originally taken by the House, even though it carried a smaller appropriation. This action by the Senate conferees prevented the House conferees from further insisting on a limitation being imposed on this fund. The House conferees, however, are still of the opinion that some limitation should have been fixed on the expenditure of this fund by the State Department, but the refusal of the Senate conferees to agree thereto made it impossible to write any limitation in the bill.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] was correct in stating that the fund carried under the head, "Representation allowances," had been tentatively allocated by the State Department in sums of \$2,000 and \$1,500 to ambassadors and ministers, respectively. Although we have some important consulates at foreign capitals, the tentative allocation of this fund did not include any in the Consular Service. On page 177 of the hearings before the House committee will be found a table showing the tentative allocation of the fund by the State Department. This table, you will find, has a column headed "rent," and the representative of the State Department, when his attention was called by the House conferees to the amount appearing in this column, stated that those amounts represented the tentative maximum allowance that would be made to the foreign representatives and that such amounts in the rent column included rent, heat, and light. It was further stated by this representative of the State Department that though it appears that separate allocations had been made for heat and light, yet the entire amount for heat, light, and rent appeared in the rent column. I will ask the chairman, Mr. SHREVE, if I am correct in my recollection as to this.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It was after we discovered this tentative allocation by the State Department that the House conferees proposed to the Senate conferees a limitation on the expenditure of this fund as previously stated.

This House has appointed a joint committee to make further study of the pay and allowance to the Army, the Navy, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Coast Guard, the Marine Corps, and the Public Health Service. To all of these there are allowances for rent, fuel, and light, but the maximum amount allowed to any officer in any of these services for rent, fuel, and light approximates \$1,500. You will understand that when the House conferees found that the State Department was considering making for this same purpose an allowance to a foreign official in the State Department as much as \$9,000, that they felt it important to place some limitation on the amount that could be expended for such purposes, and the limitation proposed would have allowed to some officials more than \$4,000 for rent, heat, and light at certain foreign posts. If the State Department is permitted to establish an unreasonable basis for rent, fuel, and light for officers in its services, it requires no stretch of imagination to see how other services will demand a like basis of allowances. When you allow for fuel, rent, and light a certain sum to any Government department for its officials, then other services which are entitled to rent, fuel, and light will insist that like treatment be accorded to them.

Congress has fixed as the maximum traveling allowance in continental America, which covers rent, heat, light, and subsistence, \$6 per day, yet if the proposal of the State Department should be approved, we would permit \$9,000 allocated to a single official for rent, heat, and light per annum.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Where is the \$9,000?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. On page 177 of the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations you will find the allocation. Looking at the table, I find \$9,000 for Madrid, \$9,000 for Habana, \$9,000 for Berlin, and other places. In this case attention may be called to Berlin.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. May I have two minutes more?

Mr. SHREVE. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. At Berlin, for instance, we find that ambassadors would be allowed \$9,000 for rent, fuel, and light. The solicitor, who is the next highest official at that post, with a salary of \$9,000, would be allowed \$1,500 for rent, heat, and light. A secretary, with a salary of \$4,000, under the tentative proposal, would be allowed for rent, heat, and light \$3,000. This difference between these officials being explained on the ground that the rent now paid by the ambassador was more than \$9,000, by the solicitor was \$1,500, and by the secretary was more than \$3,000.

My reason for calling the attention of the House to this tentative allocation by the State Department of this appropriation was prompted by the hope that it would serve to check the State Department in making unreasonable allocations for rent, heat, and light.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman knows that through the authority of Congress we have built a number of embassies and other buildings abroad, and it was thought by the State Department that if you gave a man a new home and paid the expenses of that home you ought at least to give the other man the rent that his home is costing. Is not the purpose to give everybody the same treatment, fairly and alike?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman from Maryland has been a Member of Congress even longer than I have. He was here when we revised the pay bill in 1922 for the Army, Navy, Public Health Service, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Coast Guard, all of them important agencies of the Government, with a capable personnel assigned to important duties, yet Congress gave approval to a plan whereby many in these services occupied Government-owned quarters and allowed to others for rent, fuel, and light not exceeding \$1,500. In other words, there are not sufficient Government quarters for officers in the allied services to which I have referred, and those who are not so fortunate as to be assigned to Government quarters are given a fixed allowance for rent, fuel, and light in a reasonable sum. I think this presents a parallel case to that to which the gentleman calls attention. I recognize that rental allowance in some foreign posts should be larger than at others, but Congress must be careful in giving approval to any unreasonable allowance for rent, fuel, and light to the officials in any service, because it sets a dangerous precedent, which will arise to trouble us when we come to provide for other important services which, under the law, are entitled to such allowances.

REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

The following table shows the desired increases, as compared with the allowances granted for the current year:

Tentative table of proposed allowances for 1932 for expenses of representation

| | 1931, present rate | 1932, proposed rate | 1932, increase |
|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| London | \$5,000.00 | \$5,000.00 | ----- |
| Paris | 5,000.00 | 5,000.00 | ----- |
| Berlin | 2,500.00 | 3,000.00 | \$500.00 |
| Rome | 2,500.00 | 3,000.00 | 500.00 |
| Tokyo | 2,500.00 | 3,000.00 | 500.00 |
| Buenos Aires | 2,500.00 | 3,000.00 | 500.00 |
| Habana | 2,500.00 | 3,000.00 | 500.00 |
| Istanbul and Ankara | 2,500.00 | 3,000.00 | 500.00 |
| Mexico | 2,500.00 | 3,000.00 | 500.00 |
| Rio de Janeiro | 2,500.00 | 3,000.00 | 500.00 |
| Santiago | 2,500.00 | 3,000.00 | 500.00 |
| Berne | 2,000.00 | 2,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Bogota | 2,000.00 | 2,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Lima | 2,000.00 | 2,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Madrid | 2,000.00 | 2,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Montevideo | 2,000.00 | 2,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Ottawa | 2,000.00 | 2,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Peiping | 2,000.00 | 2,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Warsaw | 2,000.00 | 2,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Brussels | 1,500.00 | 2,000.00 | 500.00 |
| Caracas | 1,500.00 | 2,000.00 | 500.00 |
| The Hague | 1,500.00 | 2,000.00 | 500.00 |
| Panama | 1,500.00 | 2,000.00 | 500.00 |
| Riga | 1,500.00 | 2,000.00 | 500.00 |
| Athens | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Belgrade | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Bucharest | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Budapest | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Cairo | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Cape Town | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Copenhagen | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Dublin | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Guatemala | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Helsingfors | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Lisbon | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Oslo | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Prague | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Sofia | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Stockholm | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Vienna | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Calcutta | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Sydney | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Tangier | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Teheran | 1,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 |
| Addis Ababa | 750.00 | 1,000.00 | 250.00 |
| Asuncion | 750.00 | 1,000.00 | 250.00 |
| Baghdad | 750.00 | 1,000.00 | 250.00 |
| Bangkok | 750.00 | 1,000.00 | 250.00 |
| Jerusalem | 750.00 | 1,000.00 | 250.00 |
| Kyoto | 750.00 | 1,000.00 | 250.00 |
| La Paz | 750.00 | 1,000.00 | 250.00 |
| Managua | 750.00 | 1,000.00 | 250.00 |
| Monrovia | 750.00 | 1,000.00 | 250.00 |
| Port au Prince | 750.00 | 1,000.00 | 250.00 |
| Quito | 750.00 | 1,000.00 | 250.00 |
| San Jose | 750.00 | 1,000.00 | 250.00 |
| San Salvador | 750.00 | 1,000.00 | 250.00 |

Tentative table of proposed allowances for 1932 for expenses of representation—Continued

| | 1931, present rate | 1932, proposed rate | 1932, increase |
|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Santo Domingo..... | \$750.00 | \$1,000.00 | \$250.00 |
| Tallinn..... | 750.00 | 1,000.00 | 250.00 |
| Tegucigalpa..... | 750.00 | 1,000.00 | 250.00 |
| Tirana..... | 750.00 | 1,000.00 | 250.00 |
| Wellington..... | 750.00 | 1,000.00 | 250.00 |
| Batavia..... | 500.00 | 750.00 | 250.00 |
| Beirut..... | 500.00 | 750.00 | 250.00 |
| Danzig..... | 500.00 | 750.00 | 250.00 |
| Hong Kong..... | 500.00 | 750.00 | 250.00 |
| St. Johns..... | 500.00 | 750.00 | 250.00 |
| Algiers..... | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 |
| Colombo..... | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 |
| Gibraltar..... | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 |
| Hamilton, Bermuda..... | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 |
| Nairobi..... | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 |
| Nassau..... | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 |
| Saigon..... | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 |
| Seoul..... | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 |
| Singapore..... | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 |
| Tunis..... | 500.00 | 500.00 | 500.00 |
| Funchal..... | 250.00 | 250.00 | 250.00 |
| Lourenco Marques..... | 250.00 | 250.00 | 250.00 |
| Malta..... | 250.00 | 250.00 | 250.00 |
| St. Michaels..... | 250.00 | 250.00 | 250.00 |
| Tananarive..... | 250.00 | 250.00 | 250.00 |
| | 92,000.00 | 125,000.00 | 33,000.00 |

EXECUTIVE ORDER RELATING TO REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. At this point I will insert Executive Order No. 5400, which makes provision for the purposes, scope, uses, and so forth, relating to representation allowances:

EXECUTIVE ORDER—REGULATIONS GOVERNING REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

In pursuance of the authorization contained in section 12 of the act of May 4, 1924 (43 Stat. 142), which provides—

"That the President is hereby authorized to grant to diplomatic missions and to consular offices at capitals of countries where there is no diplomatic mission of the United States representation allowances out of any money which may be appropriated for such purpose from time to time by Congress, the expenditure of such representation allowance to be accounted for in detail to the Department of State quarterly under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe."

the following regulations are hereby prescribed:

PURPOSES OF REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

The purposes for which representation allowances are granted are the assistance in the establishment and maintenance of official contacts, the upholding of the prestige of the United States in the communities in which its representatives are stationed, and the furthering of its interests abroad in the ways recognized as customary in various parts of the world.

SCOPE OF REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

Representation allowances are considered to include the following items:

1. Receptions on American national holidays.
2. Functions, formal or informal, such as receptions, dinners, and luncheons given upon special occasions such as the usual official receptions incident to visits of United States naval vessels, of special commissions, or upon some important happening, providing the means of reciprocating official courtesies received either at a representative's home or at public places.
3. Tips and gratuities in accordance with custom in the various countries where such gratuities are, in the opinion of the representative, necessary or desirable for the maintenance of the prestige of the United States.
4. Purchases of flowers, wreaths, etc., upon appropriate occasions such as weddings, births, and deaths of important personages.
5. Expenses for entertainment of other kinds than that provided for in paragraphs 1 and 2 when considered reasonable and desirable by the Secretary of State, provided that such expenses are shown to be for activities of representative importance.
6. Any other expenses which in the discretion of the Secretary of State are of a character to promote the representation of the United States abroad.

APPORTIONMENT OF ALLOWANCES

The Secretary of State is hereby authorized to make such allowances within the amount appropriated from year to year to any or all diplomatic offices and to any or all consular offices designated below, as he may deem desirable to accomplish the purposes for which representation allowances are granted.

The following places are hereby designated as capitals of countries, within the meaning of the act of May 24, 1924, where there are no diplomatic missions. Consular offices at these places may be granted representation allowances:

| Capital | Country | Capital | Country |
|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Aden..... | Aden. | Lourenco Marques..... | Mozambique. |
| Algiers..... | Algeria. | Luxemburg..... | Luxemburg. |
| Baghdad..... | Iraq. | Malta..... | Malta. |
| Barbados..... | British West Indies. | Martinique..... | French West Indies. |
| Batavia..... | Java. | Monaco..... | Monaco. |
| Beirut..... | Syria. | Nairobi..... | Kenya. |
| Belize..... | British Honduras. | Nassau..... | Bahamas. |
| Calcutta..... | India. | Saigon..... | French Indo-China. |
| Colombo..... | Ceylon. | St. John's..... | Newfoundland. |
| Curacao..... | Netherlands West Indies. | St. Michael's..... | Azores. |
| Dakar..... | Senegal. | San Marino..... | San Marino. |
| Danzig..... | Free City of Danzig. | Seoul..... | Chosen. |
| Funchal..... | Madeira. | Singapore..... | Straits Settlements. |
| Georgetown..... | British Guiana. | Suva..... | Fiji Islands. |
| Gibraltar..... | Gibraltar. | Sydney..... | Australia. |
| Hamilton..... | Bermuda. | Tahiti..... | Society Islands. |
| Hong Kong..... | Hong Kong. | Taihoku..... | Taiwan. |
| Jerusalem..... | Palestine. | Tananarive..... | Madagascar. |
| Kingston..... | Jamaica. | Trinidad..... | Trinidad. |
| Lagos..... | Nigeria. | Tunis..... | Tunisia. |
| Leopoldville..... | Belgian Congo. | Wellington..... | New Zealand. |

ACCOUNTING

Representation allowances are granted to offices determined by the Secretary of State, to be administered personally by the official in charge of such office. Detailed accounts shall be submitted monthly as to the expenditures made and the purposes for which they were made. Supporting vouchers shall be supplied in all cases for expenditures over \$5 made under paragraphs 1, 2, 4, and 5 of the section of this order entitled "Scope of representation allowances." A specific exception to this requirement is made under paragraph 2, where a function takes place at a representative's home. Vouchers need be submitted in this case only where a caterer or similar purveyor is called upon. In other cases an officer's certificate as to expenditures made in this connection will be sufficient. In all cases of receptions, dinners, and other entertainment sufficient information should be included in the account to show the total cost per capita, which shall constitute sufficient detail for accounting purposes.

With regard to expenditures under paragraphs 3 and 6 of the section mentioned above, the amounts expended shall be supported by certificates of the officer in charge, except that where any expenditure exceeds \$15 a supporting voucher must be obtained.

The amount granted to any one office should normally be divided into four equal parts, to be availed of to that extent every three months. This will permit an expenditure of more than one-twelfth of the fund in any one month, but will, nevertheless, prevent a too early exhaustion of the fund. If more than one-fourth is spent in any three months, an explanation should accompany the account for such excess expenditure.

Due to express provisions of law, representation allowances may not be used for expenses in connection with any of the following objects:

1. Hire, purchase, operation, maintenance, or repair of any motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles.
2. Club or association dues.
3. Printing or engraving expenses.
4. Purchase of alcoholic beverages.

According to law, competitive bids must be obtained for all expenditures in excess of \$100, except where it is manifestly impossible to obtain such bids, when the circumstances rendering the submission of such bids impossible must be completely set forth.

The utmost care shall be exercised in the submission of the accounts for this fund, under the provisions of this order. The character of the appropriation is such that it is incumbent upon each officer in the field who has charge of the expenditure of this appropriation to make certain that the items for which he spends the money are amply justified.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 22, 1930.
[No. 5400.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAMSEYER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 16110 and had come to no resolution thereon.

INTERNATIONAL GEOLOGICAL CONGRESS (S. DOC. NO. 254)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with accompanying papers ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the inclosed report from the Secretary of State to the end that legislation may be enacted to authorize an appropriation of \$110,000 for the expenses of the sixteenth session of the International Geological Congress to be held in the United States in 1932.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 17, 1931.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, the following leave of absence was granted:

To Mr. BURDICK, for four days, on account of important business in Rhode Island.

To Mr. MORGAN, for three days, on account of important business.

IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT BETWEEN AMERICANISM AND COMMUNISM

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a speech made by me at Carnegie Hall on January 9.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following speech made by me at a mass meeting at Carnegie Hall, New York City, Friday evening, January 9, 1931:

Fellow Americans, I had hoped that the committee report would have been filed before coming to speak at this patriotic mass meeting, as I must necessarily have to limit some of my remarks; but there is an abundance of material and issues, and time is virtually the only limitation set. The report, which will be submitted on January 17, will speak for itself and will go into many of the phases of communism in detail and present recommendations.

The report of the committee will be its answer to those individuals and newspapers that have criticized its creation, methods, and procedure. I am happy to state that it is my conviction that 95 per cent of the American people are behind the efforts of the committee to secure the facts in regard to communist propaganda and activities in the United States. This includes the American Legion and all war-veterans organizations, the American Federation of Labor, the New York State Chamber of Commerce, and practically all patriotic, fraternal, and religious groups in the country.

I am not here to defend my actions or those of the committee, because I know of no good reason why it is necessary to make apologies or to defend our actions. I consider the investigation by our committee the most important work of its kind done by any committee of Congress during the 10 years that I have served in that body. Our committee was directed to investigate communism, and we have done so. We made no attempt to investigate socialism, pacifism, anarchism, or radicalism.

At the outset of my remarks let me try to clear up two apparent misunderstandings in the minds of the American people in regard to Russian communism. First, I want to emphasize that there is no connection between liberalism and the brutal despotic Government of Soviet Russia; and, secondly, that the communists did not overthrow the Czar. The present Soviet Government is very far from liberalism as it is nothing more than a government of terror and by terror, through force and violence. Uninformed Americans often think of communism in the terms of liberalism, as they are under the mistaken impression that the communists overthrew the Czar or caused his abdication in March, 1917. Such is not the case. The Czar abdicated to the representative of the Duma, elected by the people, who established the provisional government which the United States was the first nation to recognize. At that time Lenin was still in Switzerland and Trotsky was living in the Bronx. It was later on that the German general staff sent Lenin and some of his followers, in a closed car, back to Russia to stir up revolution and break down the morale of the army by promising a separate peace and a division of the land among the peasants.

So many people, including judges of the supreme court in this State, have asked me this difference between communism and socialism that I shall attempt to answer it specifically. There is a vast difference between communism and socialism, although they are both offshoots of the same "Manifesto," by Karl Marx, and both seek the socialization of industry, production, transportation, and distribution of essential commodities by government agencies. The communist advocates violent revolutionary methods to overthrow existing governments, including democratic government, in order to establish a dictatorship by a minority of the proletariat to bring about socialization of industry. The socialist relies on the evolutionary methods of the ballot box and counts on enlightening public opinion and on persuasion instead of force and violence. More important still, the socialist believes in the democratic theory of popular government. Socialism ad-

vocates liberalism or the extension of democracy—the right of men to govern themselves.

The socialist has as much right as a Republican or a Democrat to urge his principles and reform measures under our laws and the Constitution. He does not seek the overthrow of our republican form of government, and he is opposed to arbitrary autocratic and absolute forms of government.

The worst enemy of the socialist is the communist, although they both are in accord on the fundamental principle that capitalism is a failure, and that socialization or nationalization of industry must replace it for the benefit of mankind.

There is nothing wrong with our republican form of Government or with our nonsocialist system of private industry, based on the time-honored American principle of individual initiative. American initiative and individualism is responsible for the tremendous development and growth of our country and for the fact that our wage earners have for years past been the best paid, the best housed, the best fed, and the most contented in the world. Just because we are in the midst of a world-wide depression is no reason for the American people losing faith in either our form of Government or in our business methods. We do not propose to alter our form of government and wipe out our cherished civil rights, gained after centuries of constant effort, to take orders from the politbureau at Moscow, the most absolute despotism the world has ever known.

Nor do we propose to substitute socialism or communism, both of which are of foreign growth, for our free, independent, American individualism that has led the world in the well-being, prosperity, high standards of wages, and of living of the working class, and has made the American worker a home and garage owner and a capitalist.

We are not looking for false remedies in the midst of our troubles; we have faith in our traditions and in the capacity of our own people to solve every problem and restore the country back on the highway to prosperity.

However, communism is in operation throughout the Soviet Union, covering far more territory and a larger population than the United States. We can not afford simply to laugh it off.

I stand for that individual independence and initiative that has been the guiding star to the astounding development and prosperity of our country and of our people. That is a true American principle; a fundamental American ideal. In spite of world wide depression, our wage earners enjoy the highest standard of living of any nation in the world. It is true we have unemployment and distress and suffering in our midst; let us hope that it is merely temporary, a set-back after many years of super-prosperity.

I would not stultify free American labor to compare them with the low paid forced labor of Russia, shackled and harnessed to their jobs whether they like it or not, like conscripted soldiers. I believe in capitalism, as opposed to communism, but capitalism shorn of its abuses and ugly greed to exploit labor and mankind for the almighty dollar.

There are some lessons we can afford to learn from the communist experiment in Russia, which, although a failure, has exposed glaring abuses in the armor of capitalism. If capitalism is to win out, it must win on its merits and for that reason it must clear its own house.

Grave abuses have crept into our industrial capitalism, such as child labor and long hours, and weighed it down so that it has difficulty in supporting itself.

Russia has adopted a 7-hour day and a 5-day week, and claims they have done away with child labor. Capitalism would do well to do away with some of man's inhumanities to man, and put into effect a maximum of eight hours a day in all industries, and a half day on Saturday, or a total of 44 hours a week.

The rack and shock of heavy industry is wearing on the nervous system and a man is thrown out on the scrap heap when he is 40 or 45 years of age. We should have a uniform Federal old-age pension law, to which the States should contribute two-thirds and the Federal Government one-third of the funds.

There is no reason why certain industries should be permitted to work its labor in industrial sections of the South far in excess of 54 hours a week, at an average pay of \$12 per week, and employ child labor.

It might be well for industrial capitalism to consider providing additional insurance protection to employees, such as sickness and partial unemployment benefits. Summer vacations might well be extended to two or three weeks for the benefit of American labor in our day and generation.

If these benefits are not sufficient, we may have to come to a 5-day week and a 7-hour day, particularly if our power of production is beyond our capacity for consumption.

I do not want anyone to feel that, because I have taken the lead by virtue of an extended official investigation, in exposing and combating the falsities and the attendant horrors of communism, that I believe that our own economic system is above reproach. Far from it; there is much that present-day industrial capitalism can learn and borrow to advantage from Russian communism.

If communism is on trial, so also is capitalism.

A house divided against itself can not stand, nor can the economic structure of the world long endure half communist and half capitalist. Either it must eventually become all socialized or all capitalized. For this reason I say that it is up to the capitalist system to clean its Augean stables and divest itself of some of its manifestations of greed, inhumanity, and reaction.

Lenin was not far from right when he said that our capitalist system would commit suicide for temporary profit. That is just what it has been doing in providing large credits to sell tractors, combines, sawmill machinery, and oil equipment to the soviets to ruin our exportable surplus in wheat, lumber, and oil, and to build up a government continually plotting, through the Communist International, to incite revolutionary activities in the United States for the sole object of overthrowing our republican form of government.

We are in the midst of a severe depression and much actual suffering and hunger in the United States, and in case of such emergency I believe the Federal Government has an obligation to see that no American family goes without food this winter when the breadwinner is willing to work but can not find employment due to circumstances beyond his control, either drought or business depression. The Congress sent \$20,000,000 worth of foodstuffs to starving Russia in 1921, and a year later the House of Representatives passed by a large vote the bill introduced by me, authorizing the expenditure of \$10,000,000 to provide food for the starving German women and children. Certainly in an emergency within the United States the Congress can do as much for our own citizens.

I introduced a bill to enable the Federal Farm Board give away through the American National Red Cross as much as 125,000,000 bushels of wheat it purchased to stabilize the American price as is necessary. I urge the immediate passage of such legislation. At any rate, the Government would not be losing much money as the wheat in storage can not be sold without depressing the price of American wheat, and there is every indication that Soviet Russia will take our foreign wheat markets away from us by next summer.

This is a subject that will be dealt with in detail in the House report, and I have not the time to discuss it here to-night, as it is an important issue in itself and requires considerable time. However, briefly, I would point out that the Russian wheat production increased in 1930 by 400,000,000 bushels through use of American tractors and combines, and bids fair to duplicate that increase in 1931 and destroy our entire wheat export trade which has averaged \$250,000,000 for the past 8 years, or three times the amount of annual purchases made in the United States by the Amtorg and all Russian agencies during the past 3 years.

A protest was recently sent to Police Commissioner Mulrooney, signed by 20 sterling patriots, including Harry Elmer Barnes, Harry E. Fosdick, and Oswald G. Villard, calling on the police commissioner to end repeated exhibitions of police lawlessness and brutality. I have much more respect for the real revolutionary communists than such types of "pink intellectuals" and sobbing socialists that have nothing better to do than to rush into print to denounce the loyal police force of New York City about alleged brutality toward communists.

What do these parlor-pink intellectuals know of communist mass tactics? Do they know when they stage a demonstration on the French or British consular office that rough-house tactics prevail, and that women and children insult and spit on the police and often scratch and bite them? The police are human beings and are carrying out orders to resist or break up these demonstrations. What would these pink intellectuals have them do? Return to their barracks and give the communist control of the city? I would like to see some of these pink denouncers of the police placed in police uniform at a communist demonstration and see what they would do if scratched and bitten by communist women in carrying out their orders. There has been too much denunciation of the police for alleged brutality by pink and metropolitan newspapers. We owe a debt of gratitude to the police in New York City. Withdraw the police force for 24 hours and let the communists loose on the city and see what a wreck they would make of it. Perhaps that would be the only means of waking some of these Kerenskies up as to the activities of the communists and to the necessity of police protection against them.

I have no personal animosity against any individual communists, but the life of one loyal policeman is more important than the lives of all the communists seeking to overthrow our republican form of government by force and violence.

The Communist Party of the United States of America is merely a section of the Communist International at Moscow and admits it obeys its orders immediately and implicitly. The program of the Communist International was fixed by a decision of the Sixth World Congress at Moscow on September 1, 1928, in which the following paragraph appears with reference to these instructions:

"The communists consider it unworthy to dissimulate their opinions or their plans. They proclaim openly that their designs can only be realized by the violent overthrow of the entire traditional social order."

As far as I am concerned, I believe there is ample justification and evidence to declare the Communist Party or any group advocating the overthrow of our republican form of government by force and violence to be illegal. In other words, I believe that the Communist Party should be outlawed, as seeking through revolutionary and military means to overthrow the Federal Government. There is no uncertainty about their revolutionary aims to replace the American flag by the red flag, and our Government by a government of soviets. It is proclaimed in all their newspapers and by all their well-known leaders.

Up to the present time history shows that all the revolts of the past have been spontaneous and native and without any apparent degree of external stimulus. The nations of the world are faced with a different and entirely new situation. The revolutionary and subversive movements of the present day are organized and

directed by the executive committee of the Communist International, or even by the smaller presidium composed of Stalin, Molotoff, Lozovsky, Katayama, and a dozen other world revolutionists at Moscow. It is all skillfully planned, timed, and executed. The propaganda is incessant and the activities relentless and insidious. There is no thought of fair dealing, justice, or humanity. The sole objective is a revolution by the proletariat. No other consideration enters into it, no mercy, no quarter, nothing but class hatred and the Soviet Union.

I am not an alarmist and do not anticipate an immediate revolutionary uprising from the communists, but I believe that the Federal Government should take precautionary measures and spend a few million dollars, if necessary, to guard against this alien revolutionary conspiracy in our midst, aimed at the heart of our government and at the life, liberty, and happiness of our people.

The Congress appropriates each year \$500,000,000 for the maintenance of the Army and the Navy. I have always voted for adequate national defense and expect to continue to do so, but I urge at the same time that we make some provision for adequate defense against our enemies from within, who are more fanatically hostile and more determined in their efforts to overthrow our republican form of government, guaranteed by the Constitution.

This seditious movement seeks to destroy every American principle, ideal, and tradition handed down to us by our fathers, and to displace the American flag with the red flag and our republican form of government by a workers' soviet government, otherwise known as a dictatorship of the proletariat.

It must be self-evident that an American citizen can not be a communist and be loyal to the United States. He can not give allegiance to the red flag and to the American flag at the same time.

I do not believe I am giving away any secrets when I state that it is very likely that the report of the committee created by the House to investigate communist activities in the United States, of which I have the honor to be chairman, will contain a definite recommendation for the strengthening of the immigration laws to deport alien communists who advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence.

There is an irrepressible conflict between Americanism and communism. It is estimated that two-thirds of all the communists in the United States are aliens. If they do not like our form of Government, let them go back to their native lands, more congenial to their doctrines. Let them cease to seek to overthrow our Government or be deported. We have tolerated their insidious activities and attacks against American institutions already too long.

Mr. Bebrits, an alien communist and editor of the revolutionary communist daily newspaper, Uj Elore, published in New York City, with a sworn circulation of 30,000, stated before the committee: "I am always fighting against capitalism and seeking to overthrow capitalism and to get a soviet government. I can not imagine a revolution without the same methods as the Russian workers and farmers used." This is a typical statement of an American communist. However, in the case of Mr. Bebrits it is worse, as he is an alien and is spreading such inflammatory doctrines every day to 30,000 Hungarians.

The communist Morning Freiheit, published in Yiddish in New York City, with a circulation of 64,000, and the Daily Worker, with 35,000 daily circulation, are just as revolutionary as the Uj Elore. These three papers have a daily circulation of 140,000, and two other communist dailies published in New York City, the Ukrainian Daily News, with a circulation of 15,225, and the Laisve, a Lithuanian paper, with 11,140, brings the total sworn daily circulation up to 156,000, of which at least 100,000 are distributed in New York City and vicinity.

Recently I put the number of communists at 100,000 in New York City, based on the vote of 17,000 cast last November for the State ticket, but in view of the sworn daily circulation of purely communist newspapers in the city of New York, I would, if anything, with all due apologies to Will Irwin and his puerile and fatuous efforts to minimize the strength of the communists, have to revise my figures upward.

The committee report, which will be submitted on January 17, I hope will contain a definite recommendation for enlarging the authority of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice and empower it to keep in constant touch with the revolutionary propaganda and activities of the communists throughout the United States.

The main reason for the creation of the House Investigating Committee was that the attention of the House of Representatives was called to the fact that since 1925 no department of the Federal Government has had any authority, power, or funds from Congress to investigate the activities of the communists, and had no knowledge or information regarding them.

It is obviously essential that some department of the Government, preferably the Department of Justice, should have ample authority to deal with communist activities.

In spite of the malicious falsehoods and appeals by communists to class hatred, the spirit of American democracy is marching on and is still the dream and the hope of the oppressed and the struggling masses the world over.

Here in our State, we have recently seen an American boy, born in poverty on the East Side, rise from the sidewalks of New York City to be elected four times by the people as Governor of the Empire State. Another example of our spirit of democracy was

the election of Herbert Hoover, left an orphan without funds in childhood, to the highest office in the gift of the American people.

Let us give thanks that we are American citizens, and live in a country that affords equal opportunity to all. Let us rededicate ourselves to the proposition that a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth, because it is the fairest, safest, soundest, and most honorable government devised by the mind of man.

DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter typical of the drought situation in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to insert a letter received from one of my constituents with reference to drought relief. This letter is typical of the many letters and telegrams I am receiving daily from my district.

The letter is as follows:

SOPER, OKLA., January 14, 1931.

HON. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CARTWRIGHT: In re drought relief for farmers.

I can not sit idly by further and not have something to say relative to drought relief for farmers, and I can not write my views like I could tell them to you; and I know that you are not the man who needs to know and realize the views like Mr. Hoover and some of the Republican leaders, because I know you are already well aware of the needs and conditions that exist in the drought-stricken areas.

As you are already well aware that it is not next summer that the farmer needs help but now. Take the seed loan for fall and winter pastures for example; it would have been worth three times as much if the fund had been available 30 days earlier. Right now thousands of farmers do not have a bite of feed for their work teams and consequently can not plow a furrow until feed is procured, and teams now without feed are getting poor and weak and, even after feed is secured, will require quite a while of good feeding before they will be able to perform a day's work, and, as you are well aware, plowing should be already done for best results in making a crop. It is not only against the farmers' interests to get a late start on their farming but is bad for us as a Nation and bad for the chances of the farmer producing enough to repay the loan. Multiplied thousands of farmers can not see far enough ahead to know whether they will possibly be able to make a crop or not. The condition is not only serious now but will be serious again this fall if relief is not forthcoming immediately.

Now, a few words as to the item for food for the farmer. I simply can not possibly conceive of the President of our Nation or any Senator or Congressman being so small as to think that a farmer can make a crop without something to eat himself. It would be like unto a farmer trying to make ties for his living and trying to farm at the same time. He would not succeed at either. You know well what I mean, because I know you have seen it demonstrated.

Now, as to the Red Cross being able to take care of the food item, they will have all they can possibly do to care for the day laborers who have no possible way of repaying a loan or ever hoping to repay a loan; and, furthermore, if the farmers are furnished with money to make a crop, that will go a long way to relieve other classes, as it will put money in circulation, and that is one of the biggest things the country needs now. No Red Cross or other charitable organization could hope to feed the farmer from now until another crop is gathered, and the farmer has no way of getting money until his crop is gathered. It is positively ridiculous to think about any charitable organization feeding the farmer that long. Farmers, as a class, are self-respecting people and are not asking for a donation but just simply a chance to borrow and repay, which everybody knows, it seems, but our Republican leaders.

I never was so disgusted in all my life with a bunch of national leaders. It seems to me that a 10-year-old boy would have better judgment than has been displayed by our President and a lot of his leaders, Mr. Barton Payne thrown in. Do you realize that their position is being resented to a woeful degree, and that if ideas do not change we are in for a state of insurrection, and then it would be no trouble for Mr. Hoover to get several million dollars appropriated to take care of a situation like that? I tell you Mr. Hoover and his Republican leaders are not seeing the condition as it exists. Farmers are not begging for food but for a chance to borrow the money with which to buy.

I am speaking the sentiments of millions in this letter, and am writing in the interest of humanity and good government. I am here in a drought-stricken area and know whereof I speak. We have untold numbers of good, self-respecting farmer citizens that have gone to the entire end of their substance and who do not want a donation, and I believe some would actually starve before accepting a donation, but they are anxious to borrow.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT, I know where you stand, and that you are doing all you possibly can, but I feel like that you are entitled to encouragement, and I hope that you can use this letter in some way to further a righteous cause.

Most sincerely yours,

E. J. NORWOOD.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 342

Resolved, That RICHARD J. WELCH, of California, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the Committee on Labor.

The resolution was agreed to.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 5688. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of New Hampshire to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or dike across Little Bay at or near Fox Point; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9991. An act to fix the salary of the minister to Liberia.

ADJOURNMENT

And then, on motion of Mr. SHREVE (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, January 19, 1931, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Monday, January 19, 1931, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

Navy Department appropriation bill.
District of Columbia appropriation bill.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

784. A letter from the Department of State, transmitting copy of a circular furnishing information with regard to proposals of candidates for the Nobel peace prize for the year 1931; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. FISH: Special committee on communist activities. A report on communist activities in the United States pursuant to an investigation under authority of House Resolution 220, together with recommendations of legislation (Rept. No. 2290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRITTEN: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 14688. A bill to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. YON: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 12381. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Everglades National Park in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1820. A bill for the relief of John Z. Lowe, former collector of internal revenue for the second district of New York; with amendment (Rept. No. 2292). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: Committee on Claims. H. R. 13932. A bill for the relief of John S. Shaw; without amendment (Rept. No. 2293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Nebraska: Committee on Claims. H. R. 14948. A bill for the relief of Emma Shelly; with amendment (Rept. No. 2294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHRISTGAU: Committee on Claims. H. R. 15080. A bill for the relief of C. H. Price; with amendment (Rept. No. 2295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 16234. A bill for the relief of the Charles LeRoy estate; without amendment (Rept. No. 2296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHRISTGAU: Committee on Claims. S. 182. An act for the relief of Daisy O. Davis; without amendment (Rept. No. 2297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: Committee on Claims. S. 4274. An act for the relief of Dr. Cooper Nicholson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 7208. A bill for the relief of Ralph McAlpin; with amendment (Rept. No. 2299). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 16296) to provide for exclusion and expulsion of alien communists; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 16297) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), and acts amendatory thereof; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 16298) granting the consent of Congress to the State of California to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Bay of San Francisco from the Rincon Hill district in San Francisco by way of Goat Island to Oakland over the Key Route Mole; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 16299) for the acquisition of land in the township of New Windsor, Orange County, N. Y., which was occupied as a camp ground by the American Army during 1782 and 1783, and the creation there of a national park, in which shall be erected a perpetual memorial to George Washington on the site of the original camp building; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 16300) to authorize payment of farm-loan mortgages with bonds issued by the mortgagee bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 16301) for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Fifteenth Census; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. ARENTZ: A bill (H. R. 16302) to authorize an investigation with respect to the construction of a dam across the Owyhee River within the Duck Valley Indian Reservation, Nev., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 16303) to amend the law relating to citizenship and naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 16304) authorizing an appropriation for the erection of a memorial to the officers and men of the United States Navy who lost their lives as the result of a boiler explosion that totally destroyed the U. S. S. *Tulip* near St. Inigoes Bay, Md., on November 11, 1864, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 16305) providing import duties on crude petroleum and its refined products imported into the United States from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 16306) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, by providing for allowance for widows, children, and other dependents of veterans of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16307) granting relief to persons held in bondage on January 1, 1863; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARNER: Resolution (H. Res. 340) to discharge and reappoint different conferees on S. J. Res. No. 49 entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of the Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOCH: Resolution (H. Res. 341) providing for the appointment of a select committee to investigate facts in connection with the oil and gas industry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 470) authorizing and directing the President of the United States to lay an embargo against the importation of crude and refined oil for sale in the United States for such period or periods as he may deem necessary for the adequate protection of our domestic-oil industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 471) to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Washington, praying the allocation to the Puget Sound Navy Yard, Bremerton, Wash., part of the construction work contemplated on certain battle-ships; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREW: A bill (H. R. 16308) granting a pension to Susie Fiedler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 16309) granting a pension to Lillie J. Goens; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 16310) granting a pension to Mandel Halpern; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 16311) granting a pension to Sallie Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGORY: A bill (H. R. 16312) granting a pension to Emma Vallandingham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANCOCK of New York: A bill (H. R. 16313) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Canfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARE: A bill (H. R. 16314) for the relief of John M. Tatum; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOGG of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 16315) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16316) granting an increase of pension to Hester A. DeVaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 16317) granting a pension to Jack Page; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: A bill (H. R. 16318) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Maxwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 16319) granting a pension to Lucretia Libby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 16320) granting a pension to Charles W. Crippen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 16321) for the relief of John Pierce; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 16322) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16323) granting an increase of pension to Harriett E. Trickler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEMP: A bill (H. R. 16324) for the relief of W. O. McDaniel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H. R. 16325) for the relief of Nettie B. Rush; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 16326) granting an increase of pension to Alfareta S. Bond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 16327) for the relief of Upson-Walton Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16328) for the relief of Jacob P. Molter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 16329) granting a pension to Bessie Humphrey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 16330) granting an increase of pension to Margaret McQueen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TABER: A bill (H. R. 16331) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Bowlby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 16332) for the relief of Lulu M. Peiper; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8634. Petition of citizens of Murrietta, Calif., opposing House bill No. 13547; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

8635. Petition of American gold-star mother, of the World War, recommending the designation of Dr. Walter J. O'Connell for Congressman of the ninth district of New York when the special election is ordered by the governor; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

8636. By Mr. BACON: Petition of sundry residents of Long Island, urging the enactment of legislation prohibiting vivisection of dogs in District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

8637. By Mr. BLANTON: Petition of Walter Jackson, Mrs. E. T. Brooks, and James F. Cox, constituting the censor board of Abilene, Tex., favoring a national censor board and protesting against permitting moving pictures depicting scenes of drinking, drunkenness, and forms of lawlessness; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8638. Also, petition of the Nolan County Federation of Women's Clubs, representing 425 women of Nolan County, sent by its committee—Mrs. C. H. Bolin, president, of Blackwell, Tex.; and Mrs. L. C. Vinson, secretary, of box 272, Sweetwater, Tex.—advocating the passage by Congress of the Cooper-Robsion bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8639. Also, petition of the Aloha Club, of the city of Abilene, Tex., sent by its committee—Mrs. Morgan Jones, Mrs. C. S. Bass, and Annie May Rankin—favoring a national censor board for moving pictures and protesting against

scenes depicting drinking, drunkenness, and forms of lawlessness; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8640. Also, petition of the Moran Parent Teacher Association, sent by its committee—Mrs. Floyd C. Pool, president, and Mrs. W. O. Hunt, secretary, Moran, Tex.—advocating the passage by Congress of the Cooper-Robsion bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8641. Also, petition of Mrs. T. Wade Hedrick, Mrs. J. Soule McDaniel, and Mrs. Dee C. Coffman, committee of the Central Parent Teacher Association, of the city of Abilene, Tex., favoring a national censor board for moving pictures and protesting against showing of scenes depicting drinking, drunkenness, vulgarity, and other forms of lawlessness; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8642. Also, petition of the Moran Study Club, sent by its committee—Mrs. M. H. Ward, president, and Mrs. C. Loudner, secretary—advocating the passage by Congress of the Cooper-Robsion bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8643. Also, petition of the Business and Professional Women's Club, of Sweetwater, Tex., sent by its committee—Emma Lee Hemby, president, Evelyn Hudspeth, secretary, and M. Lorine Williams, chairman of resolutions committee—advocating the passage by Congress of the Cooper-Robsion bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8644. Also, petition of the John H. Regan Junior High School Parent Teacher Association, of Sweetwater, Tex., sent by its committee—Mrs. Monroe Rule, president, Mrs. G. J. Diehlmann, secretary, and Miss S. Glenn Elliott, chairman of resolutions committee—advocating the passage of the Cooper-Robsion bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8645. Also, petition of the La-Kee-Kon Club, of Sweetwater, Tex., sent by its committee—Mrs. Gus Farrar, president, Mrs. C. L. Monk, secretary, and Mrs. C. A. Rosebrough, chairman of the resolutions committee—advocating the passage by Congress of the Cooper-Robsion bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8646. Also, petition of the sixth district, Texas Congress of Mothers and Parent Teacher Associations, sent by its committee—Mrs. Sidney T. Gilmore and Mrs. Joe Simmons, president, and Mrs. T. A. Crockett, secretary, of Ballinger, Tex.—advocating the passage by Congress of the Cooper-Robsion bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8647. Also, petition of the Methodist Auxiliary of the Parent Teacher Association, of Blackwell, Tex., advocating the passage by Congress of the Cooper-Robsion bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8648. Also, petition of the city council of parent-teachers, of Sweetwater, Tex., sent by Mrs. John W. Pepper, box 486, advocating the passage by Congress of the Cooper-Robsion bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8649. Also, petition of the Moran Delphian Chapter, by its committee—Mrs. Aubrey Fite, president, and Ida Leftwich, secretary, Moran, Tex.—advocating the passage by Congress of the Cooper-Robsion bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8650. Also, petition of the Woman's Missionary Society, of the St. Paul Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Abilene, Tex., sent by Mrs. Henry A. Allen, superintendent of social service, favoring the passage of House bill 9986 and Senate bill 1003, and protesting against permitting moving pictures to be shown depicting scenes of drunkenness, vice, vulgarity, and forms of lawlessness; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8651. By Mr. CLARKE of New York: Petition of the members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Merrickville, N. Y., urging Congress to enact a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures, establishing higher standards before production for films that are to be licensed for interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8652. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the board of trustees of the Federation for the Support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies of New York City, urging the passage of Senate bills 3059 and 3060 to alleviate the present unemployment situation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8653. By Mr. HALE: Petition of Joseph T. O'Neill and 26 additional veterans of foreign wars of the United States, Department of New Hampshire, Laconia Post, No. 1670, Laconia, N. H., urging passage of House bill 3493 entitled "A bill to provide for the immediate payment to veterans of the face value of their adjusted-compensation certificates"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8654. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of Saturday Lunch Club, of Minneapolis, Minn., disapproving of the recent appointment of George Otis Smith, Marcel Garsaud, and Claude L. Draper to the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8655. Also, petition of Robert A. Lee Post, No. 175, American Legion, Villard, Minn., signed by Frank A. Traxler, commander; Francis Hanson, vice commander; G. L. Hopkins, adjutant; Fred C. Taylor, finance officer; and Glenn D. Scott, chaplain, urging legislation providing for full cash payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8656. Also, petition of members of Finstad-Week Post, No. 1639, Veterans of Foreign Wars, at Willmar, Minn., demanding immediate favorable action on House bill 3494 in its entirety; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8657. Also, petition of Minnesota legislative representatives of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, protesting against Mexican labor; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8658. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of National Guard Association of the State of New York, favoring passage of House bill 12918; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8659. By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: Petition of the New Concord (Ohio) Ministerial Association, for a careful and searching investigation of the newspaper monopoly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8660. By Mr. PATMAN: Resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 54, at Princeton, W. Va., presented through Ralph Shrewsbury, post commander, and B. E. Smith, adjutant, urging the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates as proposed in House bill 3493; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8661. Also, resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 139, at Sullivan, Ind., presented through Norval K. Harris, post service officer, urging immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8662. Also, telegram of American Legion Post, No. 115, of Greer, S. C., presented by W. W. Fant, jr., adjutant, heartily indorsing plan proposed in House bill 3493 for immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8663. Also, resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 3, at Fayetteville, N. C., sent by George T. Bostic, adjutant, favoring the immediate payment of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8664. Also, statement of the American Legion Post, No. 5, at Rome, Ga., sent by C. G. Kirkland, commander, showing indorsement of the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates as proposed in House bill 3493; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8665. Also, statement of Ralph P. Cochran, adjutant of the American Legion Post, No. 88, at Derby, Vt., setting out reasons for need of immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates as proposed in House bill 3493; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8666. Also, statement of the American Legion Post, No. 11, at Blakely, Ga., expressed by O. R. Brooks, adjutant, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8667. Also, resolution of the American Legion Post, at Socorro, N. Mex., conveyed by W. E. West, post commander,

approving the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8668. Also, statement of the American Legion Post, No. 533, at Cuba, Ill., conveyed through C. R. Murphy, post service officer, favoring immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8669. Also, resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 30, at Goshen, Ind., conveyed by E. R. Hanson, post adjutant, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8670. Also, resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 33, at North Bergen, N. J., presented through John E. Casey, post commander, and John F. Dietrich, post adjutant, favoring immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates as proposed in House bill 3493; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8671. Also, resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 144, at San Marcos, Tex., conveyed through Herbert Piper, post adjutant, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8672. Also, resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 32, at Dillon, S. C., conveyed through Jesse Evans, commander, and O. J. Hayes, adjutant, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8673. Also, resolution of the American Legion Allied Post, No. 226, at Chicago, Ill., conveyed by Daniel D. Brindisi, post commander, of 1224 West Ohio Street, Chicago, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8674. Also, resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 35, at Brockton, Mass., conveyed through Forrest R. Roulstone, adjutant, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8675. Also, memorial of Lieut. Cicil H. Connolly Post, No. 75, Veterans of Foreign Wars, at San Diego, Calif., conveyed through Thomas C. Ryan, commander, post-office box 63, Pacific Beach, Calif., indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8676. Also, resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 510, at Lake Bluff, Ill., conveyed through George M. Illich, post adjutant, favoring the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8677. Also, resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 50, at Sisseton, S. Dak., conveyed through Dr. G. B. Reid, post commander, indorsing immediate payment of the full face value of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8678. Also, resolution of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post, No. 1287, Winona, Minn., conveyed through J. B. Logelin, commander, and L. K. Dudley, adjutant, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8679. Also, resolution of the American Legion Post, at Olin, Iowa, conveyed through Oscar J. Houstman, post adjutant, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8680. Also, resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 213, at Vicksburg, Mich., conveyed by Ernest B. Brinkman, post adjutant, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8681. Also, resolution of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post No. 1373, at Cle Elum, Wash., conveyed by Charles R. Samples, post adjutant, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8682. Also, resolution of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, Chapter No. 7, at Bath, N. Y., presented by Marcus Lifshutz, treasurer, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates as proposed in House bill 3493; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8683. Also, resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 31, at Lancaster, S. C., conveyed through Quay D. Hood, adju-

tant, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8684. Also, resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 92, North Judson, Ind., conveyed through L. C. Speerg, commander, and A. J. Luster, adjutant, indorsing immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates as proposed in House bill 3493; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8685. Also, resolution of the American Legion Post, No. 595, at Ohiopyle, Pa., conveyed through E. F. Creegan, post adjutant, urging immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8686. Also, resolution of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post No. 864, at Brookline, Mass., conveyed by Peter W. Pate, post commander, indorsing the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates as proposed in House bill 3493; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8687. By Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY: Petition of Local Union No. 1475, United Mine Workers of America, Panama, Ill., urging 6-hour workday and 5-day work week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8688. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Petition from the Trades and Labor Council of Wichita Falls, Tex., Carpenters' Local Union No. 977, Painters' Local Union No. 393; Retail Merchants' Association, and other like organizations, indorsing the move of the independent oil operators for an embargo on crude oil and its by-products from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8689. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of Aitkin County (Minn.) Tax Reduction League, urging the enactment of Senate bill 4123, to provide drainage bonds and thereby relieving the tax burden on many counties in Minnesota; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

8690. By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: Petition of Council of Jewish Women of West Virginia, by Mrs. Frances L. Moses, of Charleston, W. Va., urging Congress to provide for family integrity and admission of relatives of citizens and resident aliens in any immigration legislation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 19, 1931

(Legislative day of Monday, January 5, 1931)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|-----------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Ashurst | Fletcher | La Follette | Shipstead |
| Barkley | Frazier | McGill | Shortridge |
| Bingham | George | McKellar | Simmons |
| Black | Gillett | McMaster | Smith |
| Blaine | Glass | McNary | Smoot |
| Borah | Glenn | Metcalf | Steiwer |
| Bratton | Goff | Morrison | Stephens |
| Brock | Goldsborough | Morrow | Swanson |
| Brookhart | Gould | Moses | Thomas, Idaho |
| Broussard | Hale | Norbeck | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bulkeley | Harris | Norris | Townsend |
| Capper | Harrison | Nye | Trammell |
| Caraway | Hastings | Oddie | Tydings |
| Carey | Hatfield | Partridge | Vandenberg |
| Connally | Hawes | Patterson | Wagner |
| Copeland | Hayden | Phipps | Walcott |
| Couzens | Hebert | Pine | Walsh, Mass. |
| Cutting | Heflin | Pittman | Walsh, Mont. |
| Dale | Howell | Ransdell | Waterman |
| Davis | Jones | Reed | Watson |
| Deneen | Kean | Robinson, Ark. | Wheeler |
| Dill | Kendrick | Schall | Williamson |
| Fess | Keyes | Sheppard | |

Mr. WATSON. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] is absent on account of illness in his family. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

RADIO BROADCASTING AS RELATED TO LABOR

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, there are 12 channels of radio given to corporations formed for the specific purpose of broadcasting, 7 channels to corporations manufacturing radio equipment and supplies, 10 channels to corporations dealing in merchandise of various kinds, 11 channels to corporations publishing newspapers, 3 channels to public-utility corporations, 5 channels to insurance corporations, and no channel to the great body of American labor. I present a resolution of the American Federation of Labor upon that subject, and ask that it may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSING RADIO BROADCASTING RIGHTS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE, LABOR, AND INTERIOR

During the convention of the American Federation of Labor, held in Boston, October 6-17, resolutions were adopted urging Congress to adopt House Joint Resolution 334, which provides that the Federal Radio Commission shall assign three cleared-channel broadcasting frequencies to the Departments of Agriculture, Labor, and Interior. The resolutions are sent to you for your consideration, and I hope for favorable action. They are as follows:

"Whereas WCFL, the 'voice of labor' radio broadcast station, operating on 970 kilocycles, and W9XAA, its recently installed short-wave relay broadcast station, operating on 6,080 kilocycles, is the only radio station in the world which is owned, controlled, and operated by the labor movement; and

"Whereas WCFL-W9XAA, indorsed by the American Federation of Labor, and its affiliated national, international, and State organizations, is justly entitled to one of the national, cleared, unlimited-time channels out of the 90 available; and

"Whereas radio takes its place alongside of the development of the printing press and the establishment of the public school; it is the supermeans of entertainment, education, and propaganda. Whoever controls radio broadcasting in the years to come will control the Nation. For good or ill, radio will pour into the homes of the land, into the minds and hearts of the people, a constant stream of song and story, of history, science, economics, politics, and propaganda. Overshadowing and outreaching all other means of communication, radio has become the unrivaled master of human destiny; and

"Whereas radio broadcasting is the most effective means known to man for influencing public opinion. More people listen to the radio than read all the daily newspapers in the land. The mind can not conceive of the influence which radio is destined to exert upon the thinking, the habits, the character, and the progress of mankind; and

"Whereas the 'public interest, necessity, and convenience' require that this marvelous new means of communication should not be placed within the control of a few great monopolistic corporations or handed out as a free gift to a few hundred private business concerns for commercial exploitation; and

"Whereas the 'public interest, necessity, and convenience' require that radio broadcasting provide not only for entertainment but information, not only music but science, history, economics, and all other things that make for human welfare. It requires that the serious problems of life shall be presented, not from one group or one viewpoint only but from many groups and many points of view; and

"Whereas the 'public interest, necessity, and convenience' is nation-wide, it is age long; it has to do with the physical, mental, moral, social, and economic welfare of all of the people; and

"Whereas the 'public interest, necessity, and convenience' which the law fixes as the sole test for granting radio licenses is the same as the 'public welfare,' being that which contributes to the health, comfort, and happiness of the people, which provides wholesome entertainment, increases knowledge, arouses individual thinking, inspires noble impulses, strengthens human ties, breaks down hatreds, encourages respect for law, aids employment, improves the standard of living, and adds to the peace and contentment of mankind; and

"Whereas like the air we breath or the sunlight that gives us life, radio must be charged with a public trust—the heritage of mankind—and no man or corporation must be permitted to appropriate it any more than they should be permitted to appropriate the air or the ocean; and

"Whereas organized labor has contributed immeasurable service to the Nation; it has vastly improved working conditions, raised the standard of living, infused hope and courage and patriotism into millions of hearts; it has battled for needed reforms, sane and useful legislation, and social and economic justice for all who toil; it has established principles, policies, and ideals which are as essential to the welfare of our country as is sunlight to the growing fields; it has a message for all mankind; it asks no monopoly, no special privilege, no right to exploit the air for commercial profit, but asks only that it be allowed to use 1 of the 90 available radio channels in order that it may freely promulgate the principles and ideals and thereby protect and serve the entire public; and